



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 2016

No. 57

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

April 14, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable REID J. RIBBLE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

SEAN'S RUN

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

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Sean Patrick French and the tremendous community organization that was started to honor his life on its 15th anniversary.

Sean was an amazing kid, a friend to all, a community volunteer, honor roll student, and a record-breaking athlete at Chatham High School. His father has described him as someone who "never walked anywhere." His mother

has told a story about him running laps at age 8.

At Chatham High School, he was a standout, both athletically and as a member of the school community. But tragically, at age 17, he lost his life as a passenger in a drunk driving crash on New Year's Day in 2002.

Days after Sean's death, the Chatham High School community rallied around his family and organized a 100-person strong run from the high school to the memorial on Route 203. His family and friends, some of whom are with us in the gallery today, use this inspiration to preserve Sean's legacy. They asked themselves: What can we do as a community to help kids make better choices? And Sean's Run was born. This year, 2016, marks the 15th anniversary of Sean's Run and what has now expanded into a weekend-long series of events.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, as a member of this local community, Sean's Run has made a difference in our county and across the region. And as the father of three teenagers, I am personally grateful for the work of Sean's Run and what it has done to prevent similar tragedies and educate our community on the horrors of drinking and driving.

Sean's Run has worked to prevent underage drinking, impaired driving, and for increased seatbelt use by teenagers. It has helped kids think about making smart decisions and the tragic consequences that can result when they don't.

Sean's Run has grown each year—up to over 1,500 people in 2015—and the organization has become much more than an annual community 5K fundraiser and memorial. They regularly contribute to youth groups and community events to support anti-underage drinking and impaired driving programs and do pre-prom awareness events.

Sean's Run has also dedicated portions of the weekend to honor others

lost in the community, including Meghan's Mile, a mile-and-a-half youth race for children ages 12 and under. Meghan's Mile is named in honor of a friend of Sean's, Meghan Kraham, who helped found Sean's Run at age 16, but lost her life to cancer on August 18, 2007.

Since 2002, Sean's Run has awarded almost \$200,000 in grant and scholarship money. And since 2010, when I retired from the Army and returned to Columbia County, I have had the privilege to run in this 5K honoring Sean Patrick French.

This year's event will pay tribute to Sean and others through bike races, the 5K, Meghan's Mile, a prevention expo, seatbelt education, and the presentation of the Love of Running, Section II Good Sport, and Sean Patrick French Memorial Scholarships.

I am proud of the entire Sean's Run organization and the steps they have taken to prevent further tragedies such as this. Sean was a strong, smart, and caring young man whose legacy lives on through this organization every spring and throughout the year.

It is my honor to host some of Sean's family and friends today, including Sean's parents, Mark and Cathy, and his brother Eric. To them, I say thank you. Thank you for turning this tragedy into something that helps our community, and please know that you have made a difference in the lives of so many families in our country and across New York State. I look forward to, once again, honoring your son's memory by participating in Sean's Run next weekend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind Members that the rules do not allow referencing occupants of the gallery.

MARIJUANA DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1683

Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as we struggle to deal with the epidemic of opioid addiction and thousands of deaths from overdose, it is ironic that later this afternoon I will be part of a debate at the Brookings Institution about whether or not marijuana should continue to be a Schedule I controlled substance because, according to the statute, it has no medical value and a high potential for abuse.

Well, as part of the national drug reform movement, this much is clear: marijuana is less addictive, by far, than tobacco, alcohol, and cocaine. Indeed, the percentage of people who become addicted is less than 9 percent, as opposed to alcohol, cocaine, and tobacco, which is much, much higher.

It carries this designation of Schedule I despite the fact that millions of people have used marijuana and there has never been a single documented case of an overdose death.

As to medical value, it has repeatedly been confirmed. The New England Journal of Medicine did a survey in 2013 of practitioners who overwhelmingly supported the use of marijuana for medicinal purposes. It has been endorsed by 15 State medical associations, the Epilepsy Foundation, and the American Nurses Association. People who have looked at it objectively agree that there is a huge potential for benefit. And that, most compellingly, is borne out by thousands of years of human existence.

It is used by well over a million Americans in 40 States to deal with things like PTSD and chronic pain. It is well known that it helps deal with the debilitating effects of chemotherapy for cancer: nausea and the loss of appetite. Indeed, we are having families move across the country to be able to get legal access to medical marijuana in States like Colorado because it is the only remedy that they have been able to get to give relief to their infant children who suffer a debilitating type of epileptic seizures, torturing their babies, and it works for them.

Well, in the 1970s Richard Nixon rejected the advice of his own hand-picked Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse and decided to make this the centerpiece of his war on drugs. A trillion dollars later and after millions of lives being affected, we are on the verge of a national effort to right this wrong. We are going to see State after State voting to follow Oregon, Colorado, Washington, and Alaska in adult legalization.

It is time for Congress and the administration to reassess the flawed principle of making marijuana a Schedule I controlled drug, with all the resulting harms and none of the benefits. It is past time for action.

HONORING STANLEY G. TATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable individual and one of my oldest and dearest friends, Mr. Stanley Tate.

A Miami-Dade County native, Stanley Tate has successfully served many roles in his long life, including businessman, civic leader, and public servant.

From a young age, Stanley was ambitious and understood the importance of a solid education. He enrolled in the University of Florida, where he earned a bachelor's degree, followed by a graduate degree from Columbia University.

Stanley quickly proved himself to be an intelligent, capable, and resourceful individual who was willing to work hard to accomplish his goals.

Not long after school, Stanley founded a general contracting firm, building private homes and apartment buildings. As a young and driven newcomer to the industry, Stanley quickly became well known and respected for his quality work.

Never one to limit himself, Stanley continuously expanded upon his continued success, starting several other individual firms and entities that focused on consulting and investments, as well as commercial development, including office buildings, shopping centers, and restaurants.

While Stanley was focused on managing his companies, he also made it a point to be very involved in public service, both locally and on a national level. He served with the city council of Bay Harbor Islands in several capacities, including mayor and assistant mayor for 20 years. He was also on the board of directors of the Florida League of Cities and is a former chairman of the Housing Resource Team for Metro-Dade County.

Due to his vast knowledge and expertise, Stanley has served as a witness and testified before committees in both the U.S. House of Representatives and the United States Senate regarding housing and banking issues.

In addition, he was appointed by President George Herbert Walker Bush to be the chairman of the National Advisory Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, and was then nominated by President Clinton to be the president of the RTC.

One of Stanley's strongest positions is one I share. It is the belief that every family should be provided a way to save for their child's higher education. His vision became a reality with the Florida Prepaid College Plan. His tenure as the program's chairman for the first 18 years was marked by his absolute dedication and selfless devotion to maintaining the program's viability.

In recognition of Stanley's efforts, then-Governor Jeb Bush signed House Bill 263 into law on June 26, 2006, renaming the program the Stanley G. Tate Florida Prepaid College Program.

For all of these efforts and many more, Stanley Tate has been the recipi-

ent of numerous civic awards related to his work. This includes the Youth Law Center's Unsung Hero Award, the College Savings Plan USA Network's Distinguished Service Award, the Miami-Dade County Commission on Ethics and Public Trust's Arête Award, and was selected as one of the Twelve Good Men of 2004 by the Ronald McDonald House.

As a man of strong Jewish faith, Stanley has always been quite active in the Miami Jewish community and a strong and early supporter of the Democratic Jewish State of Israel.

Mr. Tate served as chairman of the Greater Miami Jewish Federation, and he has been heavily involved in the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, or AIPAC, since its early beginnings.

Mr. Speaker, throughout his life, Stanley Tate has always made it a point to give back to others by sharing his time, his knowledge, and his passions. So today I ask my congressional colleagues to join me in honoring Stanley Tate and thank him for all he has done for our south Florida community, for our State, and for our Nation as a whole.

God bless you, Stanley Tate. May you have many good years to come.

□ 1015

PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, as we were reminded yesterday by the Speaker of the House, Puerto Rico is a U.S. territory, and the Constitution explicitly gives Congress the power to "make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the U.S."

Treating Puerto Rico as property is just what is being proposed by the Republicans in addressing the Puerto Rico debt crisis. My friend here, King George of England, would be very proud.

I will say, the Governor of Puerto Rico has been working hard to help move a bill forward. He and his staff have been honest and tireless brokers, trying to resolve a crisis decades in the making. He should be commended.

But what the Governor and the people of Puerto Rico need are the same protections that any U.S. citizen has when their local government is in crisis and bondholders are circling and demanding payments. Puerto Rico needs the ability to restructure her debt so that the bondholders get something instead of nothing on their investment, the local government is not crippled, and the people are not faced with the collapse of their basic services.

Congress, the colonial power, took away the ability to declare bankruptcy, so that was never an option—a move worthy of King George himself.

Yes, in the bill the Republicans put forward, there is a restructuring of

Puerto Rico's debt. There is even a temporary stay of the debt payments for a short period of time. But at what cost?

As I understand it, the debt restructuring for Puerto Rico would only take place if two-thirds of the bondholders on Wall Street approve. So Wall Street fat cats can literally veto what Republicans are proposing. On Wall Street, the fat cats know their Maseratis and yachts are safe, even if Puerto Rican schoolbuses, hospitals, and roads fall into further disrepair. They will live like kings, just like my buddy here, King George. They even bragged about it at the hearing yesterday, saying that the market "responded positively" when the Republican bill was introduced, because it signaled that Republicans have Wall Street's back, protecting the profits of the hedge funds.

I simply do not see things in the Republican bill that justify relinquishing what little sovereignty Puerto Rico has left to an unelected Federal control board. It is a new level of colonial rule on top of what Washington already has, what Washington already misuses, what Washington usually rather ignores. King George of England would be pleased that, even after 250 years, the U.S. Congress, this Congress, created to replace his tyrannical rule, has so fully embraced colonialism for its distant territories.

As Speaker RYAN said yesterday, the fact that Puerto Rico's government is "ceding its authority to the Financial Control Board is a huge, but necessary, move that will ensure Puerto Rico will learn fiscal discipline from a board of experts."

Oh, yes, those poor islanders, those uncivilized Puerto Ricans, will see how it is done up close and personal.

The board will have the power to reduce the minimum wage, block overtime rules, block laws, regulations, and government contracts approved by the island's democratically elected government. It can overrule the legislature and the Governor if it does not like the budget, and it can fast-track energy projects at the expense of the environment.

Does that sound familiar to you, Your Highness, King George?

Get this: Congress can impose a control board on Puerto Rico that can hire whomever they want, at whatever salary they want, and the people of Puerto Rico have to pay for it—period, punto—100 percent. The control board is paid for by those it controls. If that is not colonialism, I don't know what is. It is so good, King George here would be jealous.

As if to add insult to injury, the bill addresses Vieques, the island off the coast of Puerto Rico that the U.S. Navy bombed for decades. It turns over the land with no conditions.

Now, I am all for the people of Puerto Rico having control of the lands of Puerto Rico; but in the current crisis, without protection, we all know what

is going to happen. Hotels, restaurants, and businesses seeking to profit will be looking for bargain prices and will be out to profiteer, just like the pirates who used to control those waters.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Puerto Rico want jobs and an economy that allows them to live on the island and thrive; but so far, all the Republican majority has offered is more colonial oversight, more austerity, and more misery.

I once again say this Congress should reject the King George approach and free Puerto Rico so that its hard-working people can build the island. We should put them—yes, the people—above all other creditors, bondholders, and profit seekers. That ought to be our priority. The schoolchildren, the elderly, the working men and women, the police on the beat, they need us to stand up for them as human beings, and I call on my colleagues to join me in doing just that.

CONGRATULATING LOCAL SCHOOLS ON NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUSIC MERCHANTS RECOGNITION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate staff and students at several schools in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District following their recognition from the National Association of Music Merchants, better known as NAMM.

Now, I am a big proponent of the importance of quality music education in our schools. I am very proud of what we accomplished with the repeal of No Child Left Behind and its replacement with the Every Student Succeeds Act, which really recognizes the importance of those programs such as music education.

In fact, my son is a middle school music teacher in New Jersey. We saw firsthand in our family that experience for all three of our sons. Being involved and being impacted by music education has really helped them with their creativity skills, helped them in so many different ways. Certainly, exposure to a quality music education for my youngest son, Kale, motivated him to pursue further education in music education. He did that with his undergraduate degree and is now a middle school music teacher in New Jersey, and making such a difference in the lives of the kids that he has the responsibility to teach and to influence. We are very proud of Kale, who, just this year, was selected as Teacher of the Year because of his contributions in music education and, specifically, in the lives of kids.

I am so proud that the efforts of the Moshannon Valley School District and State College Area School District have led to their recognition by NAMM as Best Communities for Music Edu-

cation, drawing attention to their support and to their commitment for music education. In fact, these two districts are among only 476 to receive this distinction nationwide—out of America's more than 13,000 school districts.

In addition, I want to mention the DuBois Area Middle School, which received NAMM's SupportMusic Merit Award, which is given to individual schools which have shown a strong commitment to the value of music education. This school is among only 118 in the Nation to be honored.

Music education is vital to the education of children across the Nation and is essential to helping them become well-rounded adults. I commend the staff, the students, and the parents in each of these communities for placing music in such high regard.

PUERTO RICO IS LEFT IN LIMBO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of our brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico who, once again, are left in limbo as Republican leaders in Congress fail to act. As jobs are lost and young workers continue to leave the island, Republican leaders have, not once, but twice, canceled plans to take up legislation in the House Natural Resources Committee this week.

As a member of this committee and a Latino, I continue to be outraged by the majority's inability to govern and respond to the humanitarian crisis on the island. Republicans will keep playing politics and use the urgency of time to force a bill that will turn out to be significantly worse for the Puerto Rican people, all while asking my Democratic colleagues for their support.

This is unacceptable. I will not vote for any deal that fundamentally misses the mark when it comes to long-term, meaningful progress, including addressing wide health disparities in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico cannot afford to risk its future at the hands of Republicans, and we cannot afford to leave behind millions of American citizens who call the island home. Mr. Speaker, we need a bill.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN JAMES JOSEPH BOYLE III

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Captain James Joseph Boyle III, who, sadly, passed away from pancreatic cancer earlier this month at the age of 73.

Captain Boyle served on my Veterans Advisory Board and was instrumental in helping advocate for veterans in Lake County, Illinois, and around our country. I am so proud to have had him as a friend and an adviser.

A resident of Libertyville, Illinois, for 34 years, Captain Boyle is remembered as being a loving husband, father, and grandfather.

Captain Boyle graduated from Loyola University in Chicago before serving in Vietnam from 1967 to 1968. As an artillery Officer, he commanded both a Marine rifle company and a Marine artillery battery at different points in his tour. For his time in Vietnam, Captain Boyle received a Bronze Star Medal, an honor well-deserved. Even long after his own service ended, Captain Boyle never stopped caring for his fellow marines. He was an active member in the Marine Corps League of Lake County.

It is because of veterans like Captain Boyle that we are able to live free from tyranny today. He is an American hero and will be greatly missed.

REMEMBERING CORPORAL RICHARD VANA

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in remembrance of Corporal Richard Vana, a member of our Greatest Generation and a veteran of the United States Marine Corps.

Corporal Vana, sadly, passed away earlier this month at the age of 92, having lived a long life, with public service at its core.

Serving during World War II, Corporal Vana was a member of the Marine Raiders and fought in the Battle of Okinawa for 99 straight days. It was during this battle that Corporal Vana and another marine rescued a wounded soldier, taking him to shelter. Without the heroic work of both men, the marine surely would have died from his injuries. Corporal Vana's outstanding service to our country did not go unnoticed, as he was awarded two Purple Hearts.

Upon returning home after the war, Corporal Vana operated a Community cab, and was a founding parishioner of St. Stephen's Church.

A family man, Corporal Vana was a loving husband and father, finding joy in his 28 grandchildren and 19 great-grandchildren.

Corporal Vana's passing is a loss not only to his friends and family, but to our community and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with this brave soldier's family and friends during this trying time.

HONORING MUNDELEIN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FOR COMPLETION OF DOORS PROGRAM

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor students at Mundelein High School for completing the Doors of Opportunity Relevant to Students, or DOORS, program.

DOORS works to help prepare students for future careers by bringing real-world skills into the classroom. Since its start in 2014, DOORS has helped train students in resume writing, interviewing, and other skills.

This year, 75 high school seniors had the opportunity to partake in mock interviews, attend career cells, and work as interns for local businesses and organizations. I was proud to be one of the many organizations to partake in this program by hosting interns in my congressional office.

Education is a fundamental building block of our Nation, and it is important that we encourage our students in every way possible. These students have taken the initiative to prepare for their future, and I have no doubt that they will be successful in whatever they put their mind to.

□ 1030

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Saturday is Emancipation Day in the District of Columbia. It marks the day, April 16, 1862, when 3,100 slaves in the District of Columbia led the way to freedom, securing their freedom 9 months before the Emancipation Proclamation freed slaves nationwide.

Isn't it ironic that, because Emancipation Day comes on a Saturday, the American people are going to have 3 extra days to file your income taxes?

Even though it is not a national holiday, it is a very special day for those of us who live in the District of Columbia because we are trying to get our full rights, the same rights as every other American.

While I vote in committee representing the people of the District of Columbia, I cannot vote on this floor. Others can vote on this floor on matters affecting my district and my district only, yet the District has more residents than two States and as many residents as about seven States in the United States. We outnumber Vermont and Wyoming.

There on this poster you see the District, Vermont, and Wyoming, yet Vermont, Wyoming, and every other State in the United States have two Senators and at least one Representative.

About seven States have one Representative who votes on this House floor. I do not vote on this House floor. The people I represent have earned every single right that every other American has.

Here on this poster are D.C.'s casualties in the major 20th-century wars, where the District of Columbia outpaced many States in casualties during those wars: World War I, more casualties than three States; World War II, more casualties than four States; the Korean war, more casualties than eight States; and the Vietnam war, more casualties than ten States.

These are American citizens who went to war for their country, died without a vote, did not come home, and their relatives today still do not have the vote on this House floor and have no vote in the Senate of the United States.

The largest irony of all, however, is shown on this poster. The people I represent here in the Nation's Capital pay

more taxes per capita—more—than any residents of any State in the United States. They pay the highest taxes—\$12,000 per person—and there are almost 700,000 people here. Who pays the lowest taxes in the United States per capita? It turns out to be Mississippi.

But wherever they come from, American citizens pay fewer taxes, less in taxes, than the people who live in their Nation's Capital, even though the people who live in the Nation's Capital live in a city that is among the oldest American cities, whose citizens still do not have their full rights as American citizens.

This is in violation of a treaty the United States signed in 1992, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The United States has been found to be in violation of that treaty because the U.S. does not give the residents of the District of Columbia the same rights as other Americans.

Ours is the only capital city in the world where those who live in their capital do not have the same rights as others, yet, as you saw in the District's casualties, this city has given and then given again.

The District wants to become the 51st State of the United States of America. That is the only way we can keep the Congress from interfering in our local affairs.

The District has to bring its own local budget to the Congress. We raise \$7 billion in the District of Columbia. Our budget has to come here for the Congress to sign off so that we can spend our own money. What kind of autocracy is this?

Of course, what is most frustrating to us is that most Americans think that we who live in your Nation's Capital have the same rights as every other American. After all, they see me on the House floor and they see me vote in committee.

The greatest frustration, of course, to us is that most Americans do not know we do not have the same rights as they, and they would not countenance for a moment that there are in our country any Americans who are treated as unequal citizens.

THANKING SHARRA FINLEY FOR SERVING CENTRAL WASHINGTON

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the gratitude of the people of central Washington State for the dedicated public service of Sharra Finley, who until last week served as my district director for Washington's Fourth Congressional District.

Sharra has a long history of serving the people of the State of Washington. For the last 10 years, Sharra worked for me also as a professional staffer for my office in the Washington State legislature and then as a professional staffer during my tenure as the director of the Washington State Department of Agriculture.

Sharra's efforts have been dedicated to assisting central Washington's constituents and keeping their concerns front and center.

On a personal note, there is simply not enough time to recount the number of stories, many filled with laughter and some with tears, which might encapsulate the last 10 years of working with Sharra Finley. Suffice it to say that she will be missed.

I am grateful for Sharra's hard work, for her sense of humor, and for her friendship. I look forward to her next steps as someone who is dedicated to her community and to her family, her husband Ellery, her daughters Emma and Abby, and her son Lane.

Congratulations to Sharra Finley on a job well done.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 36 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless abundantly the Members of this people's House. During this season of new growth, may Your redemptive power help them to see new ways to productive service, fresh approaches to understanding each other, especially those across the aisle, and renewed commitment to solving the problems facing our Nation.

May they, and may we all, be transformed by Your grace and better reflect the sense of wonder, even joy, at the opportunities to serve that are ever before us.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GIBBS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

A SEVEN-PAGE PLAN WILL NOT WORK

(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, last month, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency testified that ISIL-Daesh will attempt mass murder within the United States. Sadly, despite these many threats, the President has failed to take ISIL seriously, dismissing them as the "JV team" and describing them as "contained."

It took an act of Congress to compel the President to submit a plan to defeat ISIL and violent extremists. Over a month after the February deadline, his plan of a pathetic seven pages was released. This is not a serious plan to protect American families, eliminating terrorist safe havens.

This is not a real plan because it does not directly reference radical Islam or jihad once. It is not a real plan because it only outlines past activities. It clarifies the President's legacy of failure.

Sadly, it is clear that this does not provide a path to defeat ISIL and mass murderers. While I have confidence in our servicemembers and military leaders, they deserve a clear mission. Seven pages is not sufficient, as American families are at risk of attack.

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

GOLDMAN SACHS SHOULD BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR ITS ACTIONS

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the Justice Department reached a settlement with Goldman Sachs, where Goldman Sachs is paying \$5 billion as a result of selling bad mortgages to good people.

I want to ask the question a Vermont banker asked me: Why isn't anybody going to jail?

What they did is put together mortgages that were designed to fail, and then they sold them to police officers, to teachers, to folks who have pension

funds, with trust that Goldman Sachs was working for them.

So the banker's question from Vermont—why didn't anyone go to jail?—that is the question.

There is a second question: Why are the taxpayers paying over half of this settlement? It is tax deductible. The \$5 billion settlement, \$2.4 billion civil penalty Goldman pays, but the rest of it, about \$2.6 billion, is deductible.

And why should the taxpayers be on the hook for the misconduct, intentional misconduct, cruel misconduct, unnecessary misconduct?

Taxpayers should not be paying a cent, and the people accountable should be going to jail.

SUPPORTING THE GREAT STRIDES MIAMI 2016 TO CURE CYSTIC FIBROSIS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support Great Strides Miami 2016 and the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation.

Cystic fibrosis is a tragic, genetic disease that can cause a buildup of thick mucous in the lungs and other organs, leading to frequent infections and organ failure.

This coming Sunday, April 17, at 9 a.m., I urge my fellow south Floridians to participate in the 5K walk at historic Virginia Key Beach, located in my congressional district, to raise awareness for the need for a cure to this terrible disease.

Delaney Jade Binker, right here, what a beautiful child. Delaney Jade Binker, seen here with her loving grandmother, Bonnee, is just one of some 30,000 Americans who desperately deserve more effective treatments and a cure.

Please consider taking a few hours of your weekend to walk at Great Strides Miami to help Delaney and so many others add more tomorrows to their precious young lives.

TAX DAY AND NO CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is tax day, April 15. It is also the day that, by law, the U.S. Congress is supposed to introduce a budget.

Mr. Speaker, the sad truth is that the Republican House leadership is failing to meet even this most basic responsibility. Despite Speaker RYAN's promise months ago to return this House to regular order and restore the American people's faith that this body is working to address the needs of everyday Americans, House Republicans cannot even bring themselves to agree on a budget for us to vote on.

Hardworking American families deserve a Congress that invests in the future, protects their safety, and creates

a level playing field for them and their children to succeed. Hardworking Americans deserve a Congress that will address the growing threat of the Zika virus, which we now know is becoming more of a threat and causes birth defects. We need to address it.

Democrats will continue to press for a budget that creates jobs, raises the paychecks of the American people, and keeps them safe, while reducing the budget in a balanced and responsible way.

RECOGNIZING FOR-BOTS ROBOTICS TEAM

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week, I visited Forbush Elementary School in East Bend, North Carolina. While I was there, I had a chance to meet with the impressive students who are a part of the For-BOTS robotics team.

Although Forbush Elementary has only had a robotics team for 2 years, its students are already racking up awards. The For-BOTS team was named the grand champion of Yadkin County's First Lego League Robotics Tournament.

The team also placed first in the Robot Table Performance and Project Presentation categories in a regional tournament in Boone. Additionally, the For-BOTS placed first in Robot Programming in the North Carolina first Lego League Tournament, and they claimed a second place award in Robot Table Performance.

It is always a pleasure to visit Yadkin County Schools and witness the great things happening in classrooms across the county. It is clear the teachers and the administrators at Forbush Elementary are providing an educational experience that equips students for success.

SUPPORT THE TREAT ACT

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, in 2014, 28,000 Americans died from an overdose of opioid drugs, an annual total that has quadrupled since 1999. In Erie County, 11 people die per week from suspected opioid overdoses. Yet one in nine Americans with substance abuse problems—less than one in nine—are currently receiving treatment for their disorder. One cause is a cap that limits the number of patients a doctor can treat with opioid treatment medications such as Suboxone.

I have introduced legislation to raise these caps and expand prescribing authority to physician assistants and nurse practitioners, which is especially important in medically underserved communities. When treatment was approved for use in France without patient caps, the opioid overdose death rate declined by 85 percent in 5 years.

I urge my colleagues to support the TREAT Act, to give professionals the tools they need to treat addiction and our families new hope for recovery.

WATER RESOURCES

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, this week I spoke to a group of civil engineers, local water utility managers, and others involved in the water infrastructure industry at their 2016 Water Week Conference.

While roads and bridges and airports and train tracks get a lot of attention, water infrastructure is just as critical to the health of our Nation's economy. Water transportation is the safest and most fuel-efficient, least polluting, and least expensive means of moving goods.

The public and private sectors must work together to deliver safe and affordable water to millions of Americans every day.

In 2014, we wrote a landmark Water Resources Reform and Development Act, which was signed into law. It reformed the way the Army Corps of Engineers studies and completes their projects; it shortened the nearly endless study and environmental review process; and, most importantly, it included no earmarks.

Our economy cannot afford to see the locks and dams of our Nation's inland waterways system fail, preventing cargo from reaching its destination. Our agriculture and energy industries depend on open and secure water transportation systems, and we hope to accomplish that in WRRDA 2016.

FILIPINO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, there are more than 200,000 Filipino and Filipino American soldiers who responded to President Roosevelt's call to duty. They fought under our American flag during World War II.

These loyal and courageous soldiers suffered, fought, and gave up their lives alongside their American counterparts throughout the war; yet decades have gone by, and they are still waiting for their service to be recognized.

I have introduced H.R. 2737, legislation that is strongly supported by Members of both parties and in both Chambers, to award these deserving veterans the Congressional Gold Medal so that our country can show our appreciation and recognize them for their dedicated service and sacrifice in defeating the Imperial Japanese Army.

Today there are just 18,000 of these Filipino World War II veterans who are still alive. Time is of the essence. We cannot afford to wait. I urge my colleagues to quickly pass this legislation

so that these courageous men may be honored while they are still among us.

NATIONAL CORNBREAD FESTIVAL

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 20th annual National Cornbread Festival, which takes place in my hometown of South Pittsburg, Tennessee. This yearly event brings thousands of folks from around the country to experience the culture of southeast Tennessee.

South Pittsburg is also the home of the iconic American company Lodge Manufacturing, a major sponsor of the Cornbread Festival.

Growing up, almost all of us can remember a Lodge Cast Iron skillet playing a prominent role in home-cooked meals. The memories contained in those skillets and the family time with our loved ones are some of the most cherished.

Lodge truly embodies the spirit of American manufacturing and ingenuity. While the trend is for most companies to sell to large companies and move overseas, Lodge has continued to operate in Tennessee since 1896. In fact, many of my constituents have worked at Lodge Manufacturing for their entire lives, just like their parents and grandparents.

I appreciate Lodge Manufacturing for working to keep those American dreams alive, and I want to thank all those who play a role in hosting the National Cornbread Festival.

□ 1215

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans, I spent last weekend struggling through my taxes, and I would like to know, like other Americans, that that money is going to be used in a responsible way and that we are going to move toward fiscal stability around here.

I am the lead Democratic sponsor of Mr. GOODLATTE's constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget. In my opinion, the only way you are going to get Congress to get serious is to have a constitutional requirement that the budget be balanced and that the President submit to Congress a balanced budget.

You can't pretend you are going to do it just by cutting the heck out of everything. It has to include revenues, has to close tax loopholes and overseas tax havens and a whole bunch of other things that are leading to revenue losses.

So I am introducing an improved amendment over and above that from

Representative GOODLATTE which deals with a few concerns I have about that one.

This one clearly protects Social Security and Medicare. This one clearly closes a loophole that we can't have off-budget spending for military operations. We must have a declaration of war if you are going to exceed a balanced budget. It would require the budget be balanced within 5 fiscal years of passing this.

We have been kicking this can down the road. It is not a can anymore. It is a mountain of debt that we are giving to our kids. We have got to get serious about solving this.

RECOGNIZING MORTON PLANT HOSPITAL

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Morton Plant Hospital, which celebrates its 100th anniversary this year.

In 1912, Mr. Morton Plant was vacationing in Pinellas County, Florida, when his son, Henry, was seriously injured. He quickly realized the closest medical care was a day's drive, so he offered the community a \$100,000 endowment to open a local hospital. On January 1, 1916, the Morton F. Plant Endowed Hospital opened with 20 beds and 5 bassinets.

In the decades to come, Morton Plant Hospital would emerge at the forefront of cardiovascular health, orthopedics, neuroscience, emergency care, and neonatal health.

It has been awarded the baby-friendly hospital status by the United Nations Children's Fund. It has also been recognized by the Florida Hospital Association as the innovation of the year in patient care. Most notably, it is the only hospital in the United States to be awarded for 13 consecutive years the Top 100 Hospitals designation by Thomson Reuters.

Morton Plant was created out of a community effort, and the hospital continues to serve the Pinellas County community. I congratulate them on 100 years of service, and I offer the sincere gratitude of our Pinellas County community for Morton Plant's tireless work on behalf of patients and families.

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, at 3:30 p.m., I am hosting a public discussion at the Community College of Rhode Island Lincoln campus to highlight financial aid opportunities for students and the work we need to do in Congress to address the crisis of student debt.

Our young people are drowning in student debt. It is projected that 65

percent of the job openings by 2020 will require postsecondary education or training beyond high school, so this will become even more urgent.

The cost of education in a 4-year university has increased 250 percent since 1979, while real wages have stayed about the same.

Compared to 1979, students pay \$26,000 more per year for a private university and \$11,000 more each year at a public university. The average Rhode Island college student has over \$31,000 in student loan debt, the fourth highest in the country.

We need to guarantee young people that they can graduate from college debt free. We need to allow students to refinance existing debt at lower rates, and we need to increase Pell grants and other investments in higher education. This needs to be a national priority. We need to do it now. Our future depends on it.

CONGRATULATING JUSTIN DEETS

(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 am proud to serve, along with my colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), as co-chair of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus.

In that role, I am always excited to learn of students in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District who are excelling in their preparation for careers in growing technical education fields.

Today I want to congratulate Justin Deets, a student at Oil City High School who also studies welding at the Venango County Technology Center.

Last December Justin won first place in the annual Pittsburgh Section of the American Welding Society Competition.

On March 29, Justin was awarded \$100 for this accomplishment, a new welding helmet, jacket and gloves, along with a week at the Lincoln Electric Welding School and qualification in x-ray welding.

This is quite an achievement, which will undoubtedly open new doors for Justin. I wish him the best of success in his future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, career and technical education training transforms lives. America needs a robust reauthorization of the Perkins Act.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PROCESS FAILS NATION

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is April 15, the deadline for passing a budget. It is clear that the Republicans are going to miss it. From the start, this process has been a travesty.

Before President Obama even released his budget, Republicans announced that they would refuse to hold a hearing on it. They rejected the President's budget out of hand even before it was printed, a move unprecedented in this modern era.

Then they passed out of committee a budget that would end the Medicare guarantee, take healthcare coverage away from 20 million Americans who received it under the Affordable Care Act, and make deep cuts that harm children, students, seniors, and hard-working Americans.

Then the Tea Party wing of the GOP insisted on walking away from the bipartisan budget agreement inked just last fall.

So that brings us to today. My Republican colleagues don't seem to have a budget or a plan to move forward. The process has collapsed.

I urge my colleagues to start over and to work with Democrats to craft a budget that invests in our future and meets the challenges facing our Nation.

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National Volunteer Week to thank all of our Nation's unsung heroes: the millions of volunteers helping our communities throughout the Nation.

This Monday we kicked off the week with our first annual Heroes Among Us event to recognize some incredible people in my district who go above and beyond to make a difference in our community.

This week and every week it is important that we honor and thank these individuals for their selflessness and recognize the tremendous impact that their collective actions have on others.

Thank you to all those who helped nominate the well-deserved award winners of our Heroes Among Us event and thank you to all the volunteers and unsung heroes of Florida's 12th Congressional District and throughout the Nation. Keep up the great work. Happy National Volunteer Week.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PROCESS

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, dire needs across this great Nation demand Congress' attention: Zika virus, the crisis in Flint, the opioid epidemic, not to mention the ongoing needs for education, infrastructure, jobs, and security. Yet, Republicans will miss tomorrow's statutory deadline to pass a budget.

The majority's "Road to Ruin" budget would devastate good jobs, end the Medicare guarantee, and increase poverty. Even this was not cruel enough

for the most extreme voices in the Republican Conference who demand cuts that will hurt hardworking American families.

The majority's internal dysfunction is preventing Congress from investing in job creation, economic growth, and help for the American public.

My friends, it is time to end the games, address the dire challenges we face today, and invest in a brighter future for tomorrow.

REMEMBERING JEAN HAMILTON ALDRICH

(Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in memory of Jean Hamilton Aldrich, who passed away on March 23, 2016, at the age of 96.

Mrs. Aldrich was married to the University of California-Irvine's founding chancellor, Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr. Together they witnessed Irvine evolve into the hub for business and technology it has become today, all centered around one of the Nation's top research universities. Their work played a tremendous role in this transformation.

But Mrs. Aldrich's public service reached far beyond the university. She participated in health and arts projects throughout Orange County and served on boards for a home for the developmentally disabled and South Coast Repertory, a professional theater company in Costa Mesa.

She will long be remembered for her infectious laughter, her ability to keep her composure in high-pressure situations, and her service to the Irvine community.

Mrs. Aldrich leaves behind a rich legacy. She is survived by 3 children, 7 grandchildren, and 16 great-grandchildren.

We join them in mourning the loss of Mrs. Aldrich, who was truly a leader in our community.

GOP FAILURE TO ADOPT A BUDGET

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with good news and bad news for the American people.

The good news is that, after months of infighting, my Republican colleagues in the House and Senate have found something they all agree upon. The bad news is what they all have agreed upon is to stop doing their jobs.

In the Senate, Judge Merrick Garland, who is widely recognized as a brilliant and fair legal mind, cannot get the courtesy of a hearing or a vote. In the House, the majority is not fulfilling its legal requirement to adopt a budget for the coming year.

As one prominent Republican once wrote in the Wall Street Journal: Fail-

ing to pass a budget is "a historic failure to fulfill one of the most basic responsibilities of governing."

That was Speaker RYAN in 2011.

HONORING NICHOLAS BROWN AND MICHAEL THARP

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two heroes from the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas. Nicholas Brown of Hot Springs and Michael Tharp of Hope were awarded the American Ambulance Association Stars of Life awards this week.

These men are both veterans who served their Nation with valor before returning home to Arkansas and joining the private sector.

But their sense of duty brought them back to public service, with both men now working as emergency medical services professionals. They are first responders saving lives in their hometowns every day.

I congratulate Nicholas and Michael on this award and thank them for their service.

APRIL 15 BUDGET RESOLUTION DEADLINE

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the deadline by which Congress is supposed to have enacted its annual budget resolution.

As a former member of the Budget Committee, I take that responsibility very seriously, and I know the Speaker, the former chairman of that committee, does as well. So it saddens me that the House majority is now abdicating that responsibility.

I come from local government where we had to work on a bipartisan basis to adopt and balance budgets every year. Yet, rather than work with Democrats to advance a budget resolution that reflects the spending levels of the hard-fought 2-year bipartisan budget agreement adopted just 5 months ago, House Republicans have decided not to pass a resolution at all because some in their caucus want to undo that bipartisan agreement.

Budgets are values-based documents, but they don't have to represent just one set of values. They can be inclusive and should represent the broad diversity of the interests of the people we represent.

Working together, we can demonstrate the power of government to spur economic growth, provide for national security, and meet the needs of our people.

Mr. Speaker, one only has to look at the growing costs of the Zika virus, the opioid addiction problem, and the Flint

water crisis to realize the cost of doing nothing.

JOE MACALUSO SPILLS THE BEANS ON LOUISIANA HOTSPOTS

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Louisiana is known as the Sportsmen's Paradise. We don't have snow skiing, we don't have rock climbing, and we don't have white-water kayaking in Louisiana, but we do have our bayous, we have our alligators, and we have our oysters.

We are America's foreign country, Mr. Speaker. We are the top wintering habitat for migratory waterfowl. We are one of the top recreational fishing destinations in the Nation.

For over four decades, Joe Macaluso has been writing for the Morning Advocate, spilling the beans on our secret fishing holes, our lures, and our hunting hotspots.

Joe has been translating what is known, again, as America's foreign country to our visitors and residents alike. He has received national awards for coverage of legendary Grambling University Coach Eddie Robinson.

He has received awards for his coverage of fisheries devastation following Hurricane Andrew in 1992. He has received a lifetime achievement award from Louisiana Outdoor Writers Association, Coastal Conservation Association, and the Louisiana Wildlife Federation. He was recently inducted in the Louisiana Sports Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a good hunter and am not a good fisherman. But, with Joe "Mac," he made it easy because he was always spilling the beans. He will be sorely missed.

□ 1230

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2016.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 14, 2016 at 9:22 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 115.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 117.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 120.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 1493.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE ADOPTION OF AMENDMENT NO. 1 ON H.R. 3791

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting amendment No. 1 on H.R. 3791 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

RAISING CONSOLIDATED ASSETS THRESHOLD UNDER SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 671, I call up the bill (H.R. 3791) to raise the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 671, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3791

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

SECTION 1. CHANGES REQUIRED TO SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT ON ASSESSMENT OF FINANCIAL AND MANAGERIAL FACTORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Before the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall revise the Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement on Assessment of Financial and Managerial Factors (12 C.F.R. part 225—appendix C) to raise the consolidated asset threshold under such policy statement from \$1,000,000,000 (as adjusted by Public Law 113–250) to \$5,000,000,000.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subparagraph (C) of section 171(b)(5) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5371(b)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(C) any bank holding company or savings and loan holding company that is subject to the application of the Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement on Assessment of Financial and Managerial Factors of the Board of Governors (12 C.F.R. part 225—appendix C).”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114–489, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3791, which is a much-needed regulatory relief bill and economic growth bill, sponsored by an outstanding, energetic, and inspirational freshman on our committee, the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

As we look at the state of our economy today, we know one thing is for certain, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the economy is still not working for millions of working Americans. The economy is underperforming dramatically by any historic standard.

Given how far the economy fell from the Washington induced real estate bubble burst of 2008, history shows us that we should have had faster growth than normal during a rapid rebound phase. But it didn't happen, Mr. Speaker. There hasn't been a single year where economic growth has even reached 3 percent.

One published report on this failure noted:

There is no parallel for this since the end of World War II, maybe not since the beginning of the Republic.

Last quarter's GDP growth of only 1 percent just punctuates the matter again for working families that find themselves working harder for less. They have seen their paycheck shrink by more than \$1,600. No wonder 72 percent of all Americans believe the country is still in a recession, because they are living that reality every day. For them, the recession never ended.

I don't need polls telling me, Mr. Speaker, that the economy is not working for working families because virtually every day I receive emails or letters like these:

Carla from Mesquite, Texas, in my district writes:

We are struggling to make ends meet. My husband had temporary work for 3 months. The last 2 years, he has been looking for work and not finding any.

Michael from the town of Forney in my district back in east Texas writes:

I hear on the news how the economy is improving and I see Wall Street making money. Average folks like me are not seeing any economic improvement.

The painful truth is that the Washington hypercontrolled economy, again, is failing low- to moderate-income Americans. They simply want a fair shot, a fair shot at economic opportunity and financial security.

Perhaps nowhere—nowhere—is the hyperregulation of Washington being felt more than when it comes to the

customers of Main Street community banks. These banks are being buried under an avalanche of red tape, which is increasing costs for those customers, restricting their choices, and harming their personal finances.

Let's just look at a few examples, Mr. Speaker. Credit card rates have risen drastically, making them unaffordable and unavailable for a number of would-be borrowers. Federal regulations now on auto loans could hit some borrowers hard with a nearly \$600 increase in interest payments on a \$25,000 loan over a 4-year period.

Small business lines of credit have been cut back dramatically. And incredibly, the incredible regulatory burden placed on home buyers has now complicated the buying process and has led to fewer community banks offering home mortgages.

The fact is all of these higher costs are being felt at the same time that paychecks and savings are stagnant for working families. It just compounds the problem. The sheer weight, volume, and complexity of all of these regulations is killing prospects for new jobs, killing opportunities to spur economic growth, and it is harming working Americans. It is killing their ability to achieve financial independence through their home mortgages, through their auto loans, through their credit card loans, and through their small business lines of credit.

So it is on their behalf and on behalf of the Carlas and the Michaels of America, and millions of others like them, that we are here to pass a very simple, but very helpful, bill. It is a commonsense piece of legislation.

The bill, again, sponsored by the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE), will make it easier for our small hometown community banks to raise capital so that capital, this very same capital, can be turned around and turned into local jobs and economic growth on Main Street.

We know that passing this bill will immediately—immediately—benefit more than 400 community banks all across America. Not big banks, Mr. Speaker, not Wall Street banks, but community banks. Those are the banks, historically, that focus their attention on the needs of our local families, our small businesses, and our farmers.

As a matter of fact, passage of this bill is a longstanding goal of the Independent Community Bankers of America. At the end of the day, we shouldn't pass this bill simply because it is good for community banks. We should pass this bill because it is good for their customers—the people who benefit from the loans and services that our community banks provide, the people who will work at the jobs, the people who will help create this stronger economic growth.

Wouldn't it be nice to hear for a change that community banks are once again hiring new loan officers to serve their communities as opposed to more

regulatory compliance officers to serve their Washington masters?

That is how you help capitalize more small businesses and help families pay their bills, plan for the future, and achieve the dream of financial independence.

I, again, applaud the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE) for her leadership for fighting tenaciously for working families in her district and all across America.

I urge all Members to support and adopt H.R. 3791.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are now considering a bill that not only could put our community banks at risk, but strikes at the heart of why compromise in Congress can be so challenging.

H.R. 3791 would direct the Federal Reserve to raise the asset threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement, allowing small banks and private equity firms to take on additional debt for mergers and acquisitions. The threshold would be increased to \$5 billion in consolidated assets from \$1 billion. Let me stress that this would be 5 times as much as the current threshold and 10 times as much as the initial level that was in place before a bipartisan compromise was enacted last Congress.

The small bank holding company policy statement is important because it allows small institutions, like community banks and minority-owned depositories, to access additional debt so they can continue serving their communities. However, it is important that this threshold is carefully calibrated so it cannot be abused by speculative investors.

If the threshold is raised too high, it will have the opposite of the intended impact. It will lead to mergers and acquisitions, riskier banking activities, and a reduction in banking services and credit availability to rural, low-income, minority, and underserved communities.

Indeed, Democrats and Republicans on the Financial Services Committee worked together just a little over a year ago to provide relief to almost 5,000 community banks by doubling the asset threshold under the policy statement to the current level of \$1 billion from \$500 million in assets. We did so after working closely with regulators and determining that \$1 billion was the most appropriate threshold to help community banks grow without making them targets for mergers and acquisitions. At \$1 billion, the policy statement covers 89 percent of banks in the country, providing relief to the vast majority of community banks and minority-owned depository institutions.

I am trying very hard to understand why my colleagues are reneging on that compromise and undermining the careful, considerate policy that we en-

acted. The administration has threatened to veto this measure because of the potential danger to our smaller banks and to the communities they serve. They have called this bill an unnecessary and risky change because we know what will happen if the Federal Reserve has to make this change.

For one, raising the threshold would have a serious impact on the consolidation of community banks. The majority purports to be concerned with consolidation in the banking industry and the disappearance of community banks.

This bill will all but ensure that larger banks and investors come in and purchase smaller banks and then cut branches in the communities that need them the most. We have already seen this happen with banks across the country, both large and small, that have been forced to shut down hundreds of branches because investors and shareholders demand higher and higher returns.

I supported the change we made last year to \$1 billion because it would help ensure that small community banks are able to continue serving their communities. That is the point of the small bank holding company policy statement. We must help our communities retain access to local banks that know the specific needs of their consumers and small businesses.

This bill would do the opposite. Even those that did survive wouldn't be able to provide the same personalized service because of their size. I am particularly concerned about how this would impact our underserved communities.

Another problem with this legislation is that it would allow banks with as much as \$5 billion in assets to operate under lower standards and less oversight by regulators. Many community banks failed during the 2008 financial crisis because they became overleveraged. Certainly, if a bank makes bad decisions in the amount of risk they take on, then it is appropriate to let it fail, but the failure of any bank, and especially a bank with up to \$5 billion in assets, has a tremendous impact on the community it serves and on the Deposit Insurance Fund.

At the end of the day, more bank failures will increase premiums for all the banks protected by the Deposit Insurance Fund. We cannot allow reckless behavior that benefits investors and bank shareholders at the expense of small banks and the communities they serve.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3791 is not a small change. It is a risky move that threatens both bipartisanship and these already polarizing times, as well as the safety and soundness of our community banks and the customers they serve.

□ 1245

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on this bill. Mr. Speaker and Members, allow me to reiterate the point. We worked very hard in reaching across the aisle, in making com-

promise, in making commitments to each other, and in agreeing that we would raise the asset limit from \$500 million to \$1 billion. We had that agreement, and before the ink was dry on the deal, here we have a bill that says: So, we really didn't mean it. We want to raise it to \$5 billion. Ha, ha, ha.

People wonder why we don't compromise more, why we can't get together more, why we can't understand what is in the best interests of all of our constituents, to put aside our differences, and work on behalf of those people we say we care about. The other side claims it cares about community banks. Then why would it renege on this agreement? If it cares about community banks, why would it put them in the position of being bought up by private equity firms and special money interests, which only want to find a way to make more money and more profit by closing down branches and firing people? That is what they do. When these private equity firms come in, they borrow a lot of money in order to make these kinds of purchases. Then guess what? They have to take the money back. So guess who are the victims of this kind of agreement? They are the small banks and the constituents.

While my chairman—a gentleman whom I like very much and get along with very well—opens with statements that have nothing to do with this bill and while he talks about the plight of those in our communities who are suffering, let me tell you why they are suffering not only in his community but in communities across this country. It is because in 2008, we had a subprime meltdown and a crisis that was created by these kinds of reckless public policy attempts. We discovered that, because of all of the exotic products and all of the recklessness of some of the big banks and others, we put our people at risk, and we put our constituents at risk. Guess what? They lost their homes. Many of them are homeless and are on the streets now. Many of them cannot afford the rents that have risen because of the crisis that we have come out of.

If you really want to help small banks and community banks and if you really want to help your constituents, you will not be for a bill like this one. This only puts them at risk. I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say, number one, I find it incredible that the ranking member would say that this is going to harm community banks, which kind of begs the question: Why are they all for it? We already have their endorsements.

If the gentlewoman is concerned about big banks gobbling up small banks, then maybe it is time to repeal Dodd-Frank since the big banks have gotten bigger and since the small

banks have become fewer, and the small banks tell us that it is Dodd-Frank that is killing them. This is a bill that will help small banks survive. They will merge together as opposed to disappear from our rural communities.

With respect to increasing risk, I would urge the ranking member to read the Fed's policy statement, which reads that the Board may, in its discretion, exclude any small bank company regardless of asset size. So that takes care of that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE), the author of the bill.

Mrs. LOVE. I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, economic freedom and personal freedom run hand in hand. In order to enjoy our personal freedom, Americans need access to credit as individuals, on behalf of their families, and in their businesses. That is why I am so proud to have introduced this bill.

H.R. 3791 is a very simple bill to help small banks and savings and loan companies get access to the capital they need so as to make credit available in their communities.

These small banking institutions are critical to the people and the communities in which they reside. They support the credit needs of families, of small businesses, of farmers, and of entrepreneurs. A community bank is often the principal lending source for many people whether they are purchasing a home, starting a new business, or purchasing a vehicle. In many counties around the Nation, a community bank is the only banking presence that residents have.

When these community banking institutions are overwhelmed with regulations and mandates, many of which are meant for larger institutions, it is the hardworking middle-income and low-income families in those communities who suffer the most. Mr. Speaker, it is about people. Community banks give people the credit they need to pursue their dreams—to buy a home, to start a business. In fact, proximity to a community bank increases the chances that new small businesses will be approved for loans and will have the chance to succeed.

By raising the consolidated asset threshold under the Federal Reserve's small bank holding company policy statement from \$1 billion to \$5 billion in assets, over 400 additional small bank and thrift holding companies will qualify for coverage under the policy statement and, therefore, will be exempt from certain regulatory and capital guidelines.

These capital standards were originally established for larger institutions and disproportionately harm small holding companies. Many holding companies that are above the current threshold face challenges with regard to capital formation just when regulators are demanding higher capital

levels. These exemptions provided in the policy statement make it easier for small holding companies to raise capital and issue debt. This bill is about making sure regulations fit the size of the institution.

Mr. Speaker, a similar effort was passed into law during the last Congress under suspension in the House and by unanimous consent in the Senate. That bill raised the threshold from \$500 million, where it has been since 1996, to \$1 billion. That legislation also extended the exemption to savings and loan holding companies. While we are glad that we were able to achieve that increase which helped, roughly, 500 small bank and thrift holding companies, we would like to extend those benefits further. H.R. 3791 would bring more than 400 additional small institutions within the scope of the policy statement.

One success story that we have already seen from the previous increase was an instance in which 35 bank holding companies pooled their resources to issue debt under the policy statement. That debt was then downstreamed to the respective banks, where the capital was then used to make loans in the communities they serve, illustrating the great multiplier effect that the policy statement can produce. H.R. 3791 seeks to extend that flexibility and success to a greater number of small institutions and the communities they serve.

Opponents of this increase have alleged that changing the regulatory threshold would put communities and the Deposit Insurance Fund at higher risk, but the policy statement contains several safeguards that are designed to ensure that small bank holding companies that operate with the higher levels of debt permitted by the policy statement do not present an undue risk to the safety and soundness of their subsidiary banks.

Mr. Speaker, to sum this up, this bill is not about supporting banks. It is about supporting families, communities, and small businesses. It is about making sure that a small-business owner, like my constituent Jennifer Jones, has access to the credit she needs to expand her early childhood academy, where she teaches children to read before they reach kindergarten. It is about families who are sitting around their kitchen tables and are imagining the possibilities of renovating or of improving their homes. It is about that entrepreneur who is starting a restaurant and being her own boss. It is about the thousands of new jobs that will be created in those communities as a result.

The raising of the threshold received widespread bipartisan support in the last Congress, and I hope that the people will receive equal support this time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank very much the ranking member for yielding and for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3791.

I would like to note the Statement of Administration Policy on this bill, which reads that the bill "amounts to an unnecessary and risky change." I am disappointed that we are even considering this bill, because I thought that we had reached a thoughtful compromise—a good faith compromise—on this issue last year.

Last Congress, we came together in a bipartisan way to increase the threshold for small banks that want to make acquisitions of other banks or financial companies and that want to finance these acquisitions based—and dependent to some extent—on debt. The Fed used to prohibit banks with more than \$500 million from using debt to finance these purchases, but in recognizing that this threshold was out of date, we worked together to raise the threshold to \$1 billion last Congress. I was proud of that deal, and I thought it reflected a good faith compromise in the Financial Services Committee.

Now, less than a year later, our colleagues in the majority, apparently, want to change the deal. They want to raise the threshold from \$1 billion to \$5 billion—a 500 percent increase over the deal that we just struck a year ago. A \$5 billion bank is, needless to say, significantly larger than a \$1 billion bank, and a \$5 billion bank likely engages in a much broader range of activities than does a simple \$1 billion community bank.

Raising the threshold to this level would actually facilitate more consolidation among community banks. Banks at the high end of the \$5 billion level would take on more debt, buy smaller banks, which would, thereby, lead to the deterioration of community bank branches in the neighborhoods that we represent, and it would also lead to fewer jobs as they then seek to slim down operations.

The current policy statement already covers 89 percent of the banks in the country. Eighty-nine percent of the banks are covered by the deal we struck last year, so raising this level further is not warranted. It is risky. It is unnecessary. The Statement of Administration Policy says that it will be recommending a veto from the President of the United States. It is unnecessary; it is unwarranted; and it reverses a spirited compromise and good policy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee's Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will consider H.R.

3791, legislation to raise the consolidated asset threshold under the Federal Reserve's small bank holding company policy statement.

To say that the current regulatory environment presents challenges for small financial institutions would be a drastic understatement. Today, regulators require more and more from community-based institutions in terms of both regulatory oversight and capital requirements. Mrs. LOVE's bill seeks to alleviate some of the pressures that are facing our community banks.

Small bank and thrift holding companies confront unique challenges with regard to capital formation, which is of particular concern at a time when regulators are demanding more capital. In understanding these challenges, the Fed has recognized that small banks have limited access to equity financing.

The Federal Reserve's small bank holding company policy statement gives relief from certain capital guidelines and requirements, making it easier for a community bank to raise capital and issue debt and to make acquisitions and form new banks and thrift holding companies.

□ 1300

Our Nation's smallest banks have faced significant recession, consolidation, and an alarming number of bank failures. By increasing the threshold in the Fed's policy statement from \$1 billion to \$5 billion, we have the opportunity to help an additional 400 true community banks.

I know that the last speaker was concerned about 89 percent of the banks being already under this policy, but we are talking about 400 more communities that we can help to be able to have access to a regular stream of credit, rather than have to have increased costs and also bear restricted services from those banks.

H.R. 3791 will go a long way in ensuring that our Nation's smallest institutions are able to grow stronger and continue to serve their communities.

I want to thank Mrs. LOVE for her leadership on this issue. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 18 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 16½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members, my friends on the opposite side of the aisle, who have brought this bill to the floor, claim they care about community banks, even when we know this bill will just result in more consolidation among small financial institutions.

Just yesterday the Republicans repealed the mechanism by which we would wind down systemically impor-

tant firms. This puts us back to the days of September 2008, when our largest financial institutions could not only threaten the entire economy, but also the stability of our community banks.

Remember that when Wall Street banks cratered our mortgage system, they devastated the entire economy in ways that damaged not just workers and borrowers, but also small financial institutions.

Republicans, likewise, later today will repeal the independent funding for the Financial Stability Oversight Council, our regulator expressly charged with examining the largest, most interconnected, most complex, Wall Street firms.

Again, the Republicans want the biggest players to escape scrutiny, thereby threatening our smaller community institutions.

Republicans also have failed to put forward credible housing finance reform. Recall that in 2013 the chairman brought up his PATH Act, which would have all but excluded small banks and credit unions from the secondary market, especially handing the keys to our mortgage markets over to the largest Wall Street banks.

By eliminating Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, community financial institutions across the country would have had mortgage lending come to a halt.

Finally, remember that Republicans are willing to hold our government hostage over favors that help the largest banks and only expose our community financial institutions to more risk.

We need not go too far back to remember the 2014 fight over the government spending bill, where Republicans were willing to risk a government shutdown in order to repeal Dodd-Frank's swaps pushout rule, which would have required our largest banks to separate their riskier derivatives activity from the accounts holding depositors' money.

Let us be clear. My chairman has said over and over again, and never fails to remind us, that he hates Dodd-Frank. He wants to get rid of Dodd-Frank reforms. He said he would do anything to get rid of Dodd-Frank and the reforms that were put in place by the Congress of the United States and signed by the President.

He forgets what happened in 2008. He forgets the meltdown. He forgets the risk. He forgets about the almost depression that we found ourselves in.

He does not want to strengthen the hand of regulators. He does not believe that our regulators should have on their agenda consumer protection.

That is why, in all of this struggle, whether it is talking about the small banks or—you should hear him on the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. He hates that Bureau, and he wants to dismantle that Bureau because they do not want regulations, really, for the biggest banks in this country.

Oftentimes, what they are doing is they are benefiting the big banks, but they are making it look as if they are benefiting the smaller banks. So we have to push back very hard on these attempts.

Moving from \$1 billion to \$5 billion is an absolute unraveling of our agreement. It is wrong to work so hard with the opposite side of the aisle and come to an agreement, only to have them renege on it.

But, in the final analysis, it is because they would rather put their influence and their time in on what amounts to helping the big banks and not the small banks and forget about what this does to our communities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and, also, my good friend Congresswoman LOVE. She actually has become a very valuable member of the Financial Services Committee.

I appreciate this bill. We have to talk through something because there is something here that is just bordering on—you know, we are passing each other in the night here. That makes absolutely no sense.

Dodd-Frank: I accept some folks bathe in love for it, but it has made the big, money-center banks bigger. So a bill comes along that says there is this concentration—if you believe it is a concentration of risk—because these banks are growing bigger and bigger and bigger. And one of the big reasons they are growing bigger is because they can amortize the regulatory risk over a much bigger book of business.

The money-center banks are \$2 trillion institutions. We are talking about a \$5 billion step-up here. The small banks, which we are losing one a day, cannot cover these costs. Their regulatory costs on a much smaller book of business is putting them out of that business.

So if you want to make the big banks smaller, you can try to regulate them more. But they have demonstrated that actually is their competitive edge in the world right now. What you need to do is compete them out of their hugeness, if that is a word.

If you care about competition, if you want to stay with your rhetoric that, hey, we need to deal with these big banks and we need to keep regulating them, then create a market where other banks can start to take parts of their market share because the big banks have a different cost of money.

They have this ability to take this huge regulatory environment—sometimes five different agencies that have some level of prudential coverage—and amortize it over a book that is \$2 trillion.

How about giving smaller institutions a chance to start taking some of their market share? That is what Mrs. LOVE's bill does.

It starts to say—and we are still talking something that is tiny in the banking world—let these holding companies get up to \$5 billion. Let them actually start having a fighting chance to take some of this regulatory burden that has been shoved down their throats and start to amortize it over a little bit larger book. Because if you leave it at the smaller institutions, they cannot compete.

If you want to make the big banks smaller, create an environment where they face competition. This is a classic argument around here. Do you believe that you make the world safer by layer and layer and layer of regulation? Well, that worked great in 2008, didn't it?

We are going to file our paperwork and maybe next quarter some regulator will look at it and maybe the next 6 months someone will write a letter about it. Or do you want an environment where there is so much competition out there that there is lots of optionality in the financial markets? That is what we are looking for here.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a fairly simple argument. If you want a competitive, robust financial market in our banking world, where institutions have the ability to survive because of the crushing costs that Dodd-Frank has created. This is a simple, simple bill. It is just a chip off the iceberg that is Dodd-Frank.

Think about it in a way that this is the first step to try to create more competition to those big banks that I hear the left rail on day after day. This is a good piece of legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 13 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, also, whether the other side has any more speakers?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), the chairman of the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time. I also want to commend the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE) for an outstanding piece of legislation.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3791. Sometimes we get up here and we talk about things in a technical way. And let me just explain to you what this good piece of legislation does.

Unfortunately, over the last few years, we have lost over 1,000 commu-

nity banks in our country. In fact, we are losing them at the rate of about one a day right now.

That is important to my district because I am from the 19th Congressional District, which is a relatively rural district. I have a lot of small communities that have community banks in there. Some of them have been in business 75 or 100 years.

Unfortunately, in this environment, because of all of the regulations coming out of Dodd-Frank, many of these financial institutions are no longer viable on a standalone basis.

What is the alternative? Well, the alternative for those small banks is to search for someone to purchase them so that that bank can remain in that community.

In Texas, for example, this bill would allow 44 small bank holding companies to be able to help absorb some of those smaller banks.

Why is that important? Because in many of those communities, that little community bank is really one of the last corporate citizens standing there. They are the ones that sponsor the scoreboard for Friday night football, which is kind of big in Texas. They are the ones that support the chamber of commerce.

So what the Federal Reserve recognized is that, normally, they don't allow debt to be used as the transaction for larger holding companies, but they realized going out and getting capital for these small purchases is difficult.

So what the Federal Reserve has said is: Well, we are going to allow them to use up to 75 percent of the purchase price that can be debt.

Now, this does nothing about the safety and soundness. In other words, the holding companies that are purchasing these still have to maintain the appropriate capital ratios and all of those other things.

So this in no way affects the health of the banking industry, but it does facilitate the ability to make sure that these small community banks are able to stay in the communities they are in by being purchased by an entity that is a little bit larger that can amortize that cost.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3791 and support community banks.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman LOVE stands with Main Street. Main-Street-based community banks are why we are on the floor today, because they are at the heart of helping our families start new restaurants, get consumer financing, finance our farmers.

I come from a very rural state, Arkansas, and 70 percent of the agricultural production loans in this country

are made by our locally owned community banks.

Making it easier for them to raise capital makes it easier for our consumers and businesses to get the credit they need. For every dollar raised in capital at our banks, \$10 can be put into lending into our communities. And small bank holding companies have less access to equity financing than their larger counterparts. It has always been that way. So this effort makes complete common sense, to allow small bank and thrift holding companies to expand their capital base in an easier and more directed manner.

Dodd-Frank made it harder to raise capital because of the changes in the law about trust preferred securities and other ways that many, many small banks raised capital. So this policy statement change that Mrs. LOVE proposes is well-timed.

□ 1315

There is bipartisan support for raising this threshold to \$5 billion, notwithstanding the comments heard in today's floor conversation. Senator BROWN, Democrat in the Senate, with Mr. VITTER in the Senate last Congress, proposed \$5 billion as the appropriate level for this effort.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, concerning the ranking member's comments about raising the threshold on carte blanche relief under the policy statement that might lead to unsafe conditions, that is, in my view, not correct, Mr. Speaker, as there are numerous other restrictions and criteria that continue to apply, and the Federal Reserve retains the right to impose capital standards if it determines it necessary to protect the safety and soundness of the institutions.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HILL. This bill is about Main Street and economic growth, and it surprises me as just a Member of Congress that our President, President Obama, would issue a veto message on this bill.

This bill is about economic growth, and I applaud my good friend from Utah's efforts at championing this bill. I urge my colleagues to support its commonsense design and measure.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to set the record straight. I have in my hand a statement from United States Senator SHERROD BROWN. It is a statement on House Bill to Alter Federal Reserve Small Bank Holding Policy Statement. U.S. Senator SHERROD BROWN, ranking member of the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, issued the following statement today on legislation—that is this legislation, H.R. 3791—that would increase

the asset threshold for the Federal Reserve small bank holding company policy statement: "I understand that proponents of H.R. 3791 have mentioned a similar provision that I included in a larger bill in 2013 as somehow relevant to the current debate before the House of Representatives. It might be relevant if the House was also engaged in a real effort to address too big to fail, and it might be relevant if time had stood still. But since 2014, Congress and regulators have provided significant regulatory relief to community banks and raised the threshold of the small bank holding company policy statement to \$1 billion. Raising the threshold to \$1 billion was where Congress, regulators, and stakeholders could find broad bipartisan consensus on this issue, and I support that. I do not believe we should take further action to raise the threshold, and it is wrong to suggest otherwise."

So, ladies and gentlemen on the opposite side of the aisle, don't use SHERROD BROWN's name one more time because this statement puts that to rest. He is not in support of raising this threshold to \$5 billion.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. I rise in support of the gentlewoman from Utah's bill that would allow more small bank holding companies to raise the necessary capital to better serve not only their customers, but their communities.

H.R. 3791 would raise the consolidated asset threshold from the Federal Reserve small banking holding company policy statement from \$1 billion to \$5 billion. By simply raising this asset threshold, more institutions would be able to qualify for coverage under the policy statement and be exempt from the ongoing burdensome regulatory guidelines.

My home State of New Hampshire is chock-full of community banks and community-based financial institutions, and having a higher threshold would help more community banks in my State and others across the country meet their higher capital requirements under Basel III.

I appreciate this commonsense approach that the gentlewoman from Utah is taking, and I appreciate her leadership because just in my State, we have had a 20 percent reduction of community banks. That means the average individual who is looking for an additional loan, whether it is personal or to start a new business, they can't get access to that capital. That is hurting the very people that the other side tries to claim to support.

Just last week I heard about a woman who recently was divorced, had two kids, and is a nurse. She was looking for a mortgage to start her new life again. She was denied because of these burdensome regulations. That should

not be the intent in this country. We should be able to help those individuals who are trying to succeed, create a better life, give their children opportunity. H.R. 3791 does just that.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the bill. I, again, thank the gentlewoman from Utah for her leadership.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, while the financial crisis certainly showed that targeted regulations were needed to protect our financial system, it also showed that the real threats to the system did not come from community banks and other small financial institutions. Yet, because of high compliance costs and a fiendish complexity of the Dodd-Frank law, which all too often fails to recognize the lower risks posed by these institutions, they have been put at a disadvantage.

This bill is part of the effort by the House to institute targeted reforms and ensure that we are not holding back small, stable institutions that millions of individuals and small businesses trust.

H.R. 3791 is a well-targeted bill that will make it easier for small bank holding companies to raise capital and provide needed regulatory relief by raising the consolidated asset threshold for small bank holding companies. In doing so, this bill will benefit local economies and improve the health of the American economy as a whole.

At the same time, the bill contains important safeguards to ensure that the financial system isn't put at greater risk. In short, this bill is exactly the kind of measured approach that Congress should take to protect homeowners and investors while also ensuring that we have a vibrant, well-functioning financial sector.

I would like to thank Representative LOVE for her work on this bill and Chairman HENSARLING for his hard work and leadership. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

On Tuesday in the Committee on Rules, I reminded Members that I came to the Committee on Financial Services—it was known as the Banking Committee back then—in the wake of the savings and loan crisis. One of the biggest lessons I took away from that time was that we must be precise when we mandate changes to bank safety and soundness rules, even when our intent is to help community financial institutions.

Congress' intent may have been to help savings and loans serve their communities, but by not being measured and considered in its actions, Congress transformed the savings and loan industry into one that serves speculative investments and irresponsible CEOs.

That recklessness led to a banking crisis that brought down more than a thousand institutions, cost taxpayers more than \$120 billion, and robbed many communities of access to affordable banking products.

As I have said, it is important that the small bank holding company policy statement threshold is carefully calibrated so it cannot be abused by speculative investors. If the threshold is raised too high, it will have the opposite of the intended impact. It will lead to mergers and acquisitions, riskier banking activities, and a reduction in banking services and credit availability to rural, low-income, minority, and underserved communities.

That is why 2 years ago I worked diligently with my Republican counterparts to pass a bill that raised the threshold to \$1 billion in assets, providing additional funding resources to 89 percent of the banks in the United States. That was smart, bipartisan legislating, a decision that we came to after consulting the regulators, researching the industry, and carefully considering the ramifications of the proposal.

In addition to that bill on the small bank holding company policy statement, I and my fellow Democrats in both the House and the Senate also introduced comprehensive legislation that would reduce compliance costs at community banks. We introduced this legislation, which included carefully targeted reforms that would allow small banks to thrive rather than encouraging consolidation, as this bill would do.

Our support for small institutions is also why my fellow Democrats and I have been supportive of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which has used SMART data analysis to thoughtfully calibrate their rules for the needs of small banks.

We often forget that in the run-up to the crisis, many small banks were pushed out of the lending business by unregulated, nonbank lenders. The CFPB has now created an even playing field, and small banks and credit unions are a bigger share of the mortgage market now than they have been in years.

Carefully considered reforms provide relief to community banks without creating unintended consequences in a complex financial system with many players. Unfortunately, the legislation before us today would, as my friends across the aisle say over and over again, hurt the people it is trying to help.

After we worked in good faith with Republicans to come up with a smart, targeted reform, we are now attempting to use this issue as a political wedge. It is exactly that kind of thinking that set the groundwork for the savings and loan crisis and left thousands of communities without access to banking services.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, ever since the Dodd-Frank law was passed, none of the promises that were made have been kept. It didn't end too big to fail. Big banks have gotten bigger. Small banks have gotten fewer. Working Americans continue to fall behind. They have seen their paychecks either remain stagnant or shrink. They have certainly seen their bank accounts shrink.

After Dodd-Frank, we have seen free checking at banks cut in half. Since other financial laws of the Obama administration have been passed, we have seen 15 percent fewer credit card offerings, and on average, many of them have increased by 2 percentage points in cost, hurting working Americans who need access to credit.

For purposes of the debate today, Mr. Speaker, what is undeniable is that we are losing a community financial institution a day in America. As we lose those financial institutions, we are also losing the hopes and dreams and financial security of millions of our fellow countrymen, particularly those who live in rural areas, like huge portions of the Fifth District of Texas that I have the honor of representing in Congress.

I keep on hearing the ranking member talk about a "deal," something from the last Congress. The last time I read my Constitution, there is nothing to say that because one Congress acted on a matter, another Congress can't act on a matter. And, indeed, I am not sure we have any more urgent matter in the House Committee on Financial Services than to save community banking.

It is urgent, almost bordering on a crisis, Mr. Speaker, the loss of these banks. Small business lines of credit have been hampered, small business, the job engine of America, fueling our entrepreneurs, fueling new businesses, fueling the American Dream.

So I was happy that we passed a number of bipartisan regulatory relief provisions in this Congress. Now, regrettably, many of them were opposed by the ranking member. So I hear the rhetoric in helping community banks, and yet she opposed H.R. 766, Financial Institution Customer Protection Act supported by community banks; H.R. 1210, Portfolio Lending and Mortgage Access Act supported by community banks; H.R. 1266, Financial Product Safety Commission Act of 2015 supported by community banks; H.R. 1408, the Mortgage Servicing Asset Capital Requirements Act, supported by community banks; and the list goes on and on.

So I think the proof is kind of in the voting card, Mr. Speaker. It is Mem-

bers of this side of the aisle, especially, that are consistent in trying to help our community banks, our rural communities.

□ 1330

So right now they are all, again, Mr. Speaker, suffering from the sheer weight, volume, load, complexity, and cost of this massive Washington takeover of our banking system—the micro-management, the control by Washington.

Again, that is the primary reason we are losing a community financial institution a day. And let me tell you, they are not going to get bought up by JPMorgan. JPMorgan is not coming to Jacksonville, Texas. Goldman Sachs isn't coming to Forney, Texas.

If we don't allow these smaller banks to consolidate, we will lose them. That is the choice, Mr. Speaker. Are we going to lose our community banks in rural America?

And again, if the other side of the aisle would want to repeal their number one threat—Dodd-Frank—maybe this bill from the gentlewoman from Utah wouldn't be necessary. But it is necessary. It is an urgent situation that we deal with today.

So I want to urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3791. It is modest. It will help at least 400 community banks. Four hundred community banks will be helped. It will help them, hopefully, not only survive, but to thrive, so that they can fuel and finance the American Dream through better home mortgages, through better auto loans, through better small business lines of credit.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Utah for her hard work, for her leadership. And, again, I urge all my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3791.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. KELLY OF ILLINOIS

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 15, strike the period and insert the following: "for bank holding companies and savings and loan holding companies which have submitted to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System a credible plan to expand access to banking accounts and services, consumer and small business credit products, and bank branches in rural, low-income, minority, and otherwise underserved communities, which has been made available to the public via the holding company's website and submitted to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 671, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues have put this bill forward under a simple proposition: small- and mid-size banks need the ability to provide more lending opportunities to best serve their depositors and their communities. I agree with that premise. Access to credit is crucial to economic development, rebuilding our economy, and creating jobs.

Banks and deposit institutions are vital to creating economic opportunity. From small business loans, farm loans, and mortgage loans, to a simple checking account, access to banking services is essential for all Americans.

I firmly believe that allowing banks to access additional capital is a good idea, and good policy, so long as those banks are using those funds to lend in a fair and responsible manner to those people and entities that need it most.

My amendment is simple. It merely adds a clause at the end of the bill stating that the increase to a level of \$5 billion in assets will only apply to lenders who serve rural, minority, low-income, and otherwise underserved communities. These lenders will be required to have a clear and credible plan to expand access to banking services in those communities, and submit their plan to the Federal Reserve and to Congress.

Let me put it this way, Mr. Speaker. Suppose a very common scenario: a high school student has a part-time job after school and receives a little money each week from her parents to round out her spending cash. Suppose that student asked her parent to increase her allowance by 500 percent. She says she needs it because with school obligations, she will be working less and won't have enough money to both fill her car with gas, go to the movies, or out to dinner with friends.

Would a reasonable parent simply start handing over five times as much money as they used to? Or would they ask their daughter a few questions, making sure that the money is truly being spent on a productive thing?

The student may be completely right—a 500 percent increase may be justified—and they may have nothing but good intentions with the additional money.

But what is the harm in asking? What is the harm in making sure? It is what a responsible authority would do.

My Republican colleagues say this bill is needed to allow banks to lend—to spur economic growth and ensure banks are able to serve their customers.

What is the harm in making sure that lending goes to those credit-worthy businesses and individuals who need it most?

If we want to encourage expansion of access to credit, let's make sure it goes to where it will do the most good: a mortgage loan for a single mom working hard to achieve her vision of the

American Dream; a business loan for a small manufacturing company looking to open a new facility in an urban community that hasn't seen new jobs in years or decades; a farm loan for a small family farm so they can continue operations and raise the grain and produce what will feed the world.

My district is urban, suburban, and rural. So I have farmers, I have people from the city, and I have suburbanites. And I see the need in all of those communities.

My amendment simply states: the threshold increase will apply to you if you promise to responsibly lend to those who qualify and need it most and where it will do the most good, and to report to the Fed and Congress about how you plan on going about it. No regulations, just a simple justification.

Mr. Speaker, all creditworthy borrowers deserve fair access to the funds our banks have available to lend. Expanding lending opportunities and ensuring lenders can access capital to create more jobs and economic growth is something we all should be able to support. I simply want to ensure that when doing so, banks are responsible and provide credit broadly and fairly, including to the communities where it will do the most good.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, at best, this amendment is duplicative. Under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act, the Federal Reserve already requires all companies seeking to acquire a bank to submit an application describing how that acquisition would "meet the convenience and needs" of the target bank's community. Listing "any significant changes in services or products" and discussing "the programs, products, and activities that would meet the existing or anticipated needs of its community under the applicable criteria of the Community Reinvestment Act, including the needs of low- and moderate-income geographies or individuals."

But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, as our community banks continue to close, as they continue to suffer under the weight of the load, they don't need duplicative law. And my fear is that it is not actually duplicative. This is one more report, one additional report they are going to have to file in addition to the hundreds of other reports and paperwork that they have to fill out, one more cost that, at best, is duplicative. But the amendment is vague.

What does it mean to have a plan deemed credible? What is credible?

So here we are as a United States Congress, under the gentlewoman's amendment, yielding more of our arti-

cle I authority to the Federal Reserve. The amendment lacks procedural safeguard. It doesn't provide for a public comment on the submitted plan. It doesn't allow the company to appeal an arbitrary determination. It does not permit a company posting a plan on its Web site to necessarily redact trade secrets or personally identifiable information.

Mr. Speaker, we just need to reject this amendment. It absolutely undercuts what the gentlewoman from Utah is doing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering, if this is duplicative, why are banks closing in these communities? If there are some concerns, why not work with me instead of rejecting this amendment? If it is duplicative, then why can't we add it and see how we can make things better? I still get a lot of concerns that people who need loans in various communities that I serve still don't get them.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I would just like to point out that here is a Democrat on this side of the aisle who is offering to the Republican side to support the idea that you would raise the asset level for these small banks if only you would support minority banks, if only you would have a plan for CRA, if only you would do the right thing, if you care about the constituents, and they are rejecting it.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE), the author of H.R. 3791.

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say, while I have much respect for my colleague on the other side of the aisle, I am opposed to the amendment.

Let me reiterate again what this does. I understand that the other side of the aisle believes that we have already helped our community banks by raising the threshold from \$500 million to \$1 billion. However, we don't want to help our communities any longer or anymore?

This, again, would give access and the ability for 400 small banks to help their community. And I don't want you to think about this as 400 small banks. Please think of this as how many thousands of people these small banks are going to be able to help—people who are going to receive access to credit that they need in order to achieve their dreams.

It is time for us in Washington to stop giving people exactly what they

need to stay exactly where they are and start giving them the opportunities to go beyond, to go to the middle class and beyond, if they choose; to have the opportunities to be as ordinary or extraordinary as they choose to be.

This is going to help many people from all walks of life in all sorts of communities. And that is why I believe that we in Congress should do our job and give as many people access to this credit so that they can help their families.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Again, I just want to thank the gentlewoman from Utah for her leadership. She has made such a great impact on our Financial Services Committee.

Again, I am not sure we have a more urgent matter on our committee—we have many important matters—but when you are losing a financial institution a day in America, and thus losing the hopes and dreams of millions who count on the community financial institutions to help buy their homes, fund their cars, capitalize their small businesses, it is an urgent matter. This is an important underlying bill that will grant relief to an additional 400 community banks to survive and, hopefully, go beyond surviving to actually thriving.

As ever well-intended as the amendment is from the gentlewoman on the other side of the aisle, it puts one more stumbling block in front of these community banks who are just withering on the vine, who are struggling.

Again, it is, at best, duplicative. Everything the ranking member brought up theoretically is already addressed in section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act.

Why would you have to turn in essentially two different versions of a similar report?

More paperwork burden. At some point, it is the straw that breaks the camel's back, which absolutely breaks the back of community banking.

So it is time to reject the amendment. It is time for all Members to support H.R. 3791.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the

order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1345

FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL REFORM ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 671, I call up the bill (H.R. 3340) to place the Financial Stability Oversight Council and the Office of Financial Research under the regular appropriations process, to provide for certain quarterly reporting and public notice and comment requirements for the Office of Financial Research, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 671, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3340

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act".

SEC. 2. FUNDING.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 155 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5345) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "be immediately available to the Office" and inserting "be available to the Office, as provided for in appropriation Acts";

(B) by striking paragraph (2); and

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(2) in subsection (d), by amending the heading to read as follows: "ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE.—".

(b) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2016.

SEC. 3. QUARTERLY REPORTING.

Section 153 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5343) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) *QUARTERLY REPORTING.*—

"(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 60 days after the end of each quarter, the Office shall submit reports on the Office's activities to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

"(2) *CONTENTS.*—The reports required under paragraph (1) shall include—

"(A) the obligations made during the previous quarter by object class, office, and activity;

"(B) the estimated obligations for the remainder of the fiscal year by object class, office, and activity;

"(C) the number of full-time equivalents within the Office during the previous quarter;

"(D) the estimated number of full-time equivalents within each office for the remainder of the fiscal year; and

"(E) actions taken to achieve the goals, objectives, and performance measures of the Office.

"(3) *TESTIMONY.*—At the request of any committee specified under paragraph (1), the Office

shall make officials available to testify on the contents of the reports required under paragraph (1)."

SEC. 4. PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD.

Section 153(c) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5343(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) *PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT PERIOD.*—The Office shall provide for a public notice and comment period of not less than 90 days before issuing any proposed report, rule, or regulation.

"(4) *ADDITIONAL REPORT REQUIREMENTS.*—

"(A) *IN GENERAL.*—Except as provided under paragraph (3), the requirements under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to a proposed report of the Office to the same extent as such requirements apply to a proposed rule of the Office.

"(B) *EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN REPORTS.*—This paragraph and paragraph (3) shall not apply to a report required under subsection (g)(1) or section 154(d)(1)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 114-489, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3340, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act, and I would like to thank our colleague who authored this legislation, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER). He is certainly one of the hardest working and most thoughtful freshmen that we have on the House Financial Services Committee.

As the American people know all too well, Mr. Speaker, over years—not years, decades, in fact—Congress has ceded far too much power to unaccountable bureaucrats, Article I ceding power to Article II. At the same time, it has provided many unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats with access to money with no accountability for how that money is spent.

The Financial Stability Oversight Council, or FSOC, as it is known by its acronym, typifies this misguided yielding of power to the unaccountable and unelected.

Last month there was, however, a small victory for those who are alarmed by this ever-encroaching Fed-

eral Government and the shadow financial regulatory system that FSOC is a part of and that operates with little transparency or accountability to the American people. I speak of the recent judicial ruling that struck down FSOC's designation of MetLife as a too-big-to-fail financial institution. FSOC's decision was found to be "unreasonable" and the result of a "fatally flawed process."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the American people can achieve yet another victory today, another step in restoring the rule of law in checks and balances, by reining in an administrative state run amok, by passing the important bill that is in front of us now. FSOC is clearly one of the most powerful Federal entities to ever exist and, unfortunately, also one of the least transparent and least accountable.

First, the Council's power is concentrated in the hands of one political party, the one that happens to control the White House. All but one of FSOC's members is the Presidentially appointed head of a Federal agency, but, interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, the agencies themselves are not members, thus denying bipartisan representation. The structure clearly injects partisan politics into the regulatory process; it erodes agency independence; and it undermines accountability.

Furthermore, FSOC's budget is not subject to congressional approval, removing yet another vital check and balance of its immense power over our economy and over our people.

FSOC has earned bipartisan condemnation for its lack of transparency. Two-thirds of its proceedings are conducted in private. Minutes of those meetings are devoid of any useful, substantive information on what was discussed.

Even Dennis Kelleher, the CEO of the left-leaning Better Markets, has said "FSOC's proceedings make the Politburo look open by comparison. At the few open meetings they have, they snap their fingers, and it's over, and it is all scripted. They treat their information as if it were state secrets."

FSOC typifies not only the shadow regulatory system but, also, the unfair Washington system that Americans have come to fear and loathe: powerful government administrators, secretive government meetings, arbitrary rules, and unchecked power to punish and reward. Thus, oversight and reform are paramount, and that is why the gentleman from Minnesota drafted H.R. 3340.

The legislation before us would bring much-needed accountability and transparency to two very powerful agencies birthed by the Dodd-Frank Act: the Financial Stability Oversight Council and the Office of Financial Research.

Currently, these two agencies are funded by assessments on financial institutions, money that ultimately comes out of the pockets of their customers. These funds flow directly from financial institutions into the Office of

Financial Research coffers and are available immediately to be spent by both the Office of Financial Research and the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

H.R. 3340 is a very simple, common-sense bill. Instead of allowing unaccountable bureaucrats to set their own budgets, the bill places these two agencies on the budget review viewed by the United States Congress, the elected representatives of we, the people. It says the Council and the Office should be funded through the normal, transparent congressional appropriations process to ensure accountability and transparency.

Is it too much to ask that these two powerful government agencies actually be subject to congressional oversight and budget approval? This should be the rule for a growing number of Federal bureaucracies that are tossed into the alphabet soup of Washington regulators who have more power than ever over the financial decisions and the American Dream of our hardworking fellow citizens.

Unfortunately, I have to pose this question often to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: How much more congressional authority do we wish to outsource to regulatory agencies? Why did people run for Congress if they didn't want to legislate? Why did they run for Congress if they didn't want to engage in oversight?

Oversight is a fundamental congressional responsibility, and that includes budget oversight—most importantly, it includes budget oversight.

Mr. Speaker, sooner or later the shoe is going to be on the other foot. Sooner or later the White House will be in different hands. Sooner or later Congress will be in different hands, so this should not be a partisan issue. This is about Article I of the Constitution. All Members on both sides of the aisle should care passionately about this issue, to hold agencies accountable for their spending, because we are not just writing legislation for one Congress or one administration.

The bare minimum level of accountability to the elected representatives of we, the people, is to have Congress control the power of the purse. It is part of our quintessential and essential oversight responsibilities, regardless of who sits in the Oval Office or who resides in the Speaker's chair. If we are going to do our job, that means Congress must exercise its Article I responsibilities, and H.R. 3340 will help us do just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 3340, which would impede the important work of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, commonly referred to as FSOC, and the Office of Financial Research, referred to as OFR, by subjecting their funding to the congressional appropriations process.

This bill would also hamstring the OFR's ability to conduct impartial research by requiring the Office to solicit public comment before issuing any report, rule, or regulation.

Just in case people don't understand who FSOC is, it includes the Federal Reserve, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the National Credit Union Association, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, and independent members with insurance expertise, chaired by the Treasury Secretary.

What you have is every representation from all of these oversight and regulatory agencies coming together, working together in the best interests of this country, identifying risk and where that risk is and what to do about it. But the changes that are now being suggested or being made in this bill will have serious adverse effects on financial stability in the United States.

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act created FSOC to oversee and prevent threats to our financial markets, and the OFR was established to support FSOC's critical work with analytical research. Dodd-Frank specifically empowered both agencies with independent budgets, the same way our other banking regulators, like the Federal Reserve, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, operate. The FSOC and OFR are funded outside of appropriations, through fees on large financial institutions. They were meant to be funded by the institutions they oversee and be shielded from congressional politics.

Republicans say they want accountability by overseeing regulators' budgets, but what they really want is control, so they can eliminate funding for these agencies altogether. This bill would prevent efforts to properly mitigate systemic risk, to the detriment of the entire economy; and in this Congress, it would subject the agencies to the uncertainty caused by the dysfunctional, failed Republican budget process.

All we have to do is look at the struggles facing the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. They continue to be underfunded, despite dramatic changes in the markets. It is a struggle every year to secure adequate resources to supervise complex institutions to the benefit of industries, but at dramatic cost to our economy.

Understandably, the administration opposes this bill, and the President's senior advisers would recommend a veto. The administration specifically says that subjecting these bodies to congressional appropriations would hinder their independence and would limit their ability to monitor and address threats to financial stability.

In addition, this bill would interfere with OFR's work.

Republicans also say they want transparency and cost-benefit analysis with regard to OFR's activities, but what they really want is to give industry a leg up on our regulators. In addition, by requiring the OFR to tell the industry what it is studying, the bill would corrupt OFR's findings and could have a chilling effect on its important work.

For similar reasons, I also will be urging my colleagues to oppose an amendment by Mr. ROYCE that we will consider later on today that requires detailed disclosure of the OFR's research agenda and practices. This is not the norm of any research organization and would severely limit OFR's ability to conduct rigorous, impartial analyses.

Our regulators need to act with certainty, impartiality, and position resources to conduct robust oversight of our financial markets so that we can properly detect and deter systemic risk. Unfortunately, this bill will be a step back in that effort, not forward, and it is further evidence that Republicans seek to dismantle Dodd-Frank and the improvements we have made in our financial markets, one bill at a time.

I am going to urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), the sponsor of H.R. 3340.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. I thank my colleague from Texas, Chairman HENSARLING.

Mr. Speaker, I am a believer in a transparent and accountable government; and if a Federal institution is failing to meet these fundamental criteria, Congress needs to act.

Unfortunately, the Financial Stability Oversight Council, more commonly known in Washington as the FSOC, and the Office of Financial Research, more commonly called the OFR, currently operate in the shadows, outside of congressional oversight and the democratic process.

□ 1400

This has led to nonsensical and heavy-handed abuse by the government of numerous financial companies that had absolutely nothing to do with causing the 2008 financial crisis.

While I strongly believe that those who created the crisis must be punished, I can't stand by while businesses that had nothing to do with the crisis are being unjustly burdened with new regulations that force American consumers to pay higher prices for essential financial products like home mortgages and student, auto, and business loans.

That is why I have introduced the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act. Not only will the bill reduce mandatory spending by \$1.3 billion over the next 10 years, it will

make the FSOC and OFR accountable to the American people through their elected representatives.

Over the years, Congress has given much of its power to unelected bureaucrats. This legislation returns the constitutional power of the purse back to Congress by subjecting FSOC and the OFR to the appropriations process.

As you know, FSOC is authorized to identify risks to the financial stability of the United States. This authority allows the FSOC to designate nonbank institutions as systemically important financial institutions, or SIFIs, which, in turn, increases supervision and regulation of these firms by the Federal Government.

The Office of Financial Research was created to provide the research and analysis necessary for the FSOC to carry out this statutory mandate.

In a classic Washington fox-guarding-the-henhouse scenario, the FSOC and OFR are currently funded through taxes or assessments, as we prefer to call them, that they collect from the very SIFIs they designate.

These unelected bureaucrats then set their own budgets without any oversight or approval by Congress. Is it any surprise that the FSOC budget is already five times larger today than it was in 2010.

Senator Dodd and Representative Frank both have acknowledged that they never intended that insurance companies be designated as nonbank SIFIs.

Despite the stated intent by the authors of the Wall Street Reform Act, FSOC has already designated three insurance companies as nonbank SIFIs.

Unfortunately, further complicating the problem, FSOC has failed to create a viable off-ramp for designated companies and has not shared with Congress how they make these designations in the first place.

OFR has received its fair share of criticism, too. In 2013, their asset manager report wasn't only condemned by the industry, but the Federal Government Securities and Exchange Commission also expressed concerns.

According to a Reuters report, the SEC was concerned that the people who conducted the study at OFR "lacked a fundamental understanding of the fund industry itself" and "the Treasury's research arm failed to take a number of the SEC's critical feedback into account." Thus, the SEC created its own comment period for the report.

Better Markets, a group that regularly advocates for increased government regulation, actually criticized the OFR for the inexplicably and indefensibly poor quality of the work presented in the report.

Despite all of this and the fact that Congressman Frank has also condemned the idea of designating asset managers, many fear the FSOC will move next with an asset manager SIFI designation.

For these reasons, I believe it is absolutely critical that we pass the Finan-

cial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act.

It is crucial for the FSOC and OFR to be more transparent and accountable to the American people. Subjecting these entities to the congressional oversight process, enhancing OFR quarterly reporting requirements and allowing Americans to weigh in on OFR rules and regulations gives Congress the tools it needs to provide the proper oversight of FSOC and OFR.

Now, some may argue that Congress should just trust these bureaucracies. But our Constitution makes it abundantly clear that Congress and Congress alone has the power of the purse. And like one of our great leaders once reminded us: "Trust, but verify."

I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership on this issue. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS from California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member WATERS.

Mr. Speaker, this is a strange day. I almost feel like we are existing in parallel universes. On the one hand, today—today—is the deadline for the Rules Committee to meet to structure debate on a budget resolution. But it is clear by now that there will be no floor consideration of a resolution today or tomorrow or the day after or very possibly ever.

Instead, the headlines in Capitol Hill news publication after publication are all about how the appropriations process has descended into "chaos." "Chaos." So we have that on the one hand.

Then on the other hand we have a bill on the floor that subjects the Financial Stability Oversight Council to that very same chaotic appropriations process.

On the one hand, the appropriations process is in chaos. On the other hand, this bill moves valuable, critical, and important economic regulators into that same chaotic appropriations process. Have you ever heard the expression: Does the left hand know what the right hand is doing?

When the majority talks about putting agencies in the appropriations process, I hear a lot of high-minded talk and rhetoric—and appropriately so—about the Constitution and our Founding Fathers.

How would Alexander Hamilton have funded the FSOC? Frankly, I think it is great to ask those questions. I ask myself those questions every day.

Everyone who takes the oath of office and has the privilege to stand here ought to keep grasping for the answers to those questions. And how appropriate this week.

Yesterday was Thomas Jefferson's birthday. So I was going back and re-reading something about him, his phi-

losophies and contributions. Absolutely. We should all do that.

But we also have a responsibility to stay anchored in reality, to lay down laws for the country and the Congress we have—the Congress we have—not the country and Congress we all wish we had.

We live in an era of huge, complex financial markets, and we have learned again and again and again that those markets fail, sometimes wiping out \$13 trillion in net worth in this country in a month. That is devastating. Somebody has to be looking at the whole system and working to shore up its weaknesses.

We live in an era of a broken appropriations process. It is chaotic. Today's Congress is not Madison's perfect vision.

Regardless of the ideals of article I of the Constitution, the reality today is that moving an agency into a chaotic appropriations process is to subject that agency to that very same chaos, to uncertain funding, to the risk of shutdown and backroom deals.

So let's find a budget resolution, fix the appropriations process, and then maybe, just maybe, we can talk about moving agencies into the appropriations process.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I will wrap up quickly. I thank the ranking member for the time.

But, for now, my friends, ladies and gentlemen, FSOC is too important. The risk of financial crisis is too great. Have we not learned that lesson, what happens?

To subject the only crisis prevention regulator to the dangers of a chaotic appropriations process—and that is what we have, it cannot be denied—is the last thing we can do.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) who is chairman of our Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3340, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act introduced by my good friend, Representative TOM EMMER, from Minnesota.

This is an important part. When I go back home and people hear about a bill that has been passed or new regulations that come out and they have a question about that—and particularly, I guess, under this administration, we have heard a lot of people say: What are you all going to do about that new rule that the administration pulled up? You all have the power of the purse. Why don't you do something about that?

The Founders were very clear about having different branches of government. One of the things that creates a

lot of consternation for a lot of people is that they see some of these agencies created in Dodd-Frank, like the Financial Stability Oversight Council, FSOC, which has no accountability to anybody.

They operate in an unaccountable and not very transparent way, and they have a huge amount of impact on markets. In fact, when they determined that MetLife was systemically important, a Federal judge the other day said that they reached that conclusion inappropriately, that they weren't transparent, they weren't open, and that they didn't actually follow their own rules in determining this entity being systemically important.

So why in the world would we not want them to be accountable to the taxpayers? Because, ultimately, all of this money, Mr. Speaker, belongs to the American taxpayers and they are expecting this Congress to review the actions of many of these agencies.

I am amused at my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They kept talking about how important many of these entities are and what a great job they are doing, yet they are not willing to allow them to be accountable and to come forth and make a case why they should be spending the money they are spending or why they are taking the actions that they are taking.

Talking about Mr. Jefferson, this is not the government that our Founders intended. In fact, they were really reluctant to form a Federal Government, to give a centralized government any power.

But they did ultimately determine that there would be some good about that, primarily for the common defense. I don't think they intended to create agencies that had no accountability.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

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

Mr. Speaker, how soon we forget. If the movie "The Big Short" made you mad—and I hope you have seen that movie—then what the Republican House leadership is proposing today should make you furious.

After the financial crash in 2009, we acted. The Congress acted. We understood that we didn't have a wholistic picture of the risk across the financial markets before the crash.

So we made a decision to create the Financial Stability Oversight Council, FSOC, as they call it, to police these too-big-to-fail companies and to rein in the risks in our largest financial institutions.

Now some of the biggest banks want the oversight to stop so they can bring back their risky, anything-goes casino banking practices, the exact practices that tanked the housing market and destroyed retirement savings for millions of Americans in the 2008 Wall Street collapse.

This bill, H.R. 3340, pushed by Republicans and their big bank patrons, will neuter this important oversight body, blindfolding our government again and making another economic meltdown more likely.

I feel as though every couple of weeks the Republicans here in the House are giving us another memory test. They bring a bill up that tests whether we remember that just 7 years ago our financial markets crashed because of risky behavior on Wall Street.

I remember that that happened. Democrats remember that that happened. The American people remember that that happened. Apparently, the Republicans in Congress do not remember that.

But we are going to keep passing this memory test and pushing back against these kinds of efforts to water down the Dodd-Frank reforms.

Let me ask this, Mr. Speaker: How many of your constituents—I know none of mine—have asked to gut the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to strip critical oversight of our Nation's largest financial institutions, and to make another financial crash likely? Nobody is asking for that.

Americans deserve better. They see day in and day out a Congress out of step with their priorities, and they want change. In fact, right now thousands of Americans are engaging in direct action on the Capitol Grounds asking for campaign finance reform and restoration of voting rights. Instead of voting once again to support the big banks and Wall Street, we should be listening to them and taking action to restore their voice in politics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to push back against congressional amnesia and to oppose this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the chairman of our Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time. I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for putting forth a piece of legislation that will shine the light of day on some of Dodd-Frank's most secretive creations.

We often hear our friends from the other side of the aisle and regulators talking about their concerns over the so-called shadow banking system.

The FSOC and its members have used this sinister term on multiple occasions to strike fear in the hearts of the public in order to advance, basically, their growth-strangling regulatory regime.

But the real threat is not from shadow banking. The real threat comes from the shadow regulatory system that basically operates outside of our system of checks and balances with absolutely no accountability to the public and with little or no input from the Congress to conduct our proper oversight. You see, the FSOC and the OFR

are the embodiment of this shadow system.

For years now, the FSOC has continuously denied our committee's simple request for some information about how it operates and about its proceedings. Really, all we know about these meetings are a few sentences that it drops into their press releases.

Meanwhile, even though the OFR embarrassed itself with its asset manager report that was issued back in 2013, that office basically still operates largely outside of the public eye.

So it is time to shine the light of day on both of these bodies, Mr. Speaker, particularly in light of the recent invalidation of MetLife's too-big-to-fail designation by FSOC.

□ 1415

The underlying legislation would restore Congress' Article I authority by putting Congress back in charge of funding both FSOC and OFR, by requiring OFR to submit regular reports to Congress that the American public can see.

It is time to stop letting bureaucrats in this town run wild, let's put Congress back in charge, and let's put back the checks and balances for these troubling agencies.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank her for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 3340, a bill that would cause severe damage to the integrity of the Financial Stability Oversight Council and the Office of Financial Research. It is through these entities that the Dodd-Frank Act identifies risks in our financial systems and guards against another financial crisis.

FSOC and OFR have been intentionally placed outside political pressure. They make our financial system safer and protect the American people from a future financial crisis. However, the bill we are debating today would cripple FSOC and OFR by subjecting them to unnecessary political influence, putting our financial system at risk.

My colleagues across the aisle would have us believe that FSOC and OFR have free rein to set and approve their own budgets, and are, therefore, agencies that have run amok. FSOC's budget is approved by a majority vote of its members. FSOC does not have unchecked budget authority. FSOC's budget is similar to, and modeled after, the FDIC's budget mode.

The FDIC also sets its own budget. It has time and time again acted to protect the American people from financial collapse while setting a reasonable and prudent budget.

No one is calling on Congress to rein in the FDIC. The bill is nothing more

than an attempt by the majority to undo the progress made by Dodd-Frank and to eliminate the ability of FSOC to act on behalf of the American people by cutting its funding.

As I listened to my colleague from Maryland a few minutes ago talk about the folks who are right outside this Capitol, complaining about Citizens United, people want to know that they have power. These people are very upset. They want to know that their democracy is not being taken away from them.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and against all bills that seek to roll back our progress in making the financial system safer.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 14½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 15 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3340, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support the creation of FSOC and OFR and do not think that 10 unelected agency heads should be able to have such influence over the U.S. financial system. But H.R. 3340 doesn't even curtail any of FSOC's or OFR's powers. It simply provides greater accountability by making their budget subject to the annual Congressional appropriations process.

Strengthening congressional oversight would force FSOC and OFR to address questions and concerns from both sides of the aisle. Requiring OFR to report quarterly to Congress and provide the standard public notice and comment period before issuing any report or regulation is just common sense. In fact, it would ultimately serve the public interest to provide transparency and diverse perspectives on issues affecting the financial services industry.

The FSOC has the authority to declare large companies as "systematically important financial institutions" and then subject them to a new, costly regulatory regime that is designed for banks. I have serious concerns about their power, but this bill wouldn't even change that. It would only provide desperately needed transparency and accountability to the SIFI designation process, which was recently described by a Federal judge as "fatally flawed" and "arbitrary and capricious."

2008 demonstrated that we need effective regulation of our financial system, but regulators need to be held accountable for their decisions, especially given the impact they have on the competitiveness of U.S. companies.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. EMMER for his legislation.

I strongly urge the adoption and passage of this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friends on the opposite side of the aisle keep talking about accountability and what Congress' responsibility is and what the Constitution says we should do. But I find it very interesting, while they are claiming that OFR and FSOC should be given more oversight, they don't seem to really want to exercise the responsibility to do that.

Republicans claim that only when OFR and FSOC are subject to the annual appropriations process, will these two entities be accountable to Congress.

However, how many times has the Financial Services Committee requested the director of the Office of Financial Research to testify?

Only one time.

Section 153 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires that the OFR director testify before our committee annually, and yet, OFR Director Berner has only been invited to testify once in the last 4 years—the only time being in March of 2013. That means for more than 3 years, our committee, under Republican leadership, has shirked its duties to oversee the OFR. Any Member who has met Director Berner can attest that he has always stated his eagerness to update Congress on what OFR is doing.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not some valiant attempt to hold FSOC and OFR accountable, no. This bill is yet another attack on a Dodd-Frank financial reform by Republicans, who never supported financial reform in the very first place.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3340, the so-called Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act.

This bill represents another example of death by a thousand cuts from our friends on the other side of the aisle. It is another Republican attack on the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

After the catastrophe of the financial crisis and the near collapse of our banking system, Republicans are, once again, jeopardizing the stability of our financial system.

How many times will Republicans waste taxpayer dollars with these partisan and dangerous attacks on the independence of our financial regulators?

Dodd-Frank created the Financial Stability Oversight Council and the Office of Financial Research to bring independent regulators together to monitor risk across our banking system and address threats to the American economy. Prior to the creation of FSOC, no single entity was accountable for monitoring our Nation's financial stability—none. It was a mish-mash, disparate mess. Dodd-Frank filled that void.

Similarly, OFR works to support consumers by conducting critical research on our financial system and whether our regulatory systems are, in fact, working.

Of course, if we don't invite the person who is the head of the Office to actually testify in front of the Financial Services Committee, how would we know?

Dodd-Frank ensured that important regulators like FSOC and OFR have the independence they need to protect consumers outside of the political turmoil of Congress. My House Democratic colleagues are serious about reining in our Nation's largest financial institutions, while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are playing political games at the expense of American consumers.

I refuse to stand idly by and allow Dodd-Frank to be gutted and weakened. If this terrible bill got to his desk, President Obama wouldn't sign it. He would never allow it to become law. Nevertheless, congressional Republicans continue to waste taxpayers' time and money with this legislation that would peel back Dodd-Frank and hurt American consumers.

House Republicans need to instead focus on our Nation's most pressing problems: public health crises like the Zika virus, which has ravaged my home State of Florida; the ongoing debt situation in Puerto Rico; and keeping Speaker RYAN's promises to the American people that this body would pass a budget.

Our Nation's working families are keeping their fiscal houses in order.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Florida an additional 1 minute.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We need to make sure that we hold Speaker RYAN's feet to the fire and make sure that he keeps his promise to the American people that this body will pass a budget, which we have yet to do.

Our Nation's working families are working hard to keep their fiscal house in order. It is long past time for the House Republicans to do the same, while also making sure that we protect American consumers.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is how we got into the worst economic crisis and nearly crashed the banking system in the first place. If we leave policymaking to the Republicans who are in the majority here, they would take us back to a time when we had a Wild West of regulation that left consumers twisting in the wind and banks to be able to make any decision they wanted and run over consumers all across America. We saw how well that worked out in 2008.

Now we have come through the worst economic crisis we have ever had since the Great Depression—73 straight months of job growth in the private sector. We need to continue that progress, not go backward.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this very important issue to the House floor.

I am pleased to stand up in support of H.R. 3340, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act.

I want to congratulate Congressman TOM EMMER of Minnesota for his tireless work on this bill to come up with a commonsense piece of regulation that helps create jobs in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to set the RECORD straight. There are some folks in this Chamber who continue to blame the economic problems we have had over these past years specifically on the financial services industry. Well, let's be honest here. There were D.C. regulators here in this town who put tremendous pressure on the banks to lend money at zero percent down and zero percent interest to folks who they knew could not afford these loans. When they were unable to repay these loans, the real estate market collapsed and brought the economy with it.

Mr. Speaker, every business in America, every industry, should be fairly and predictably regulated. However, when the regulations are so intense and so complicated and so smothering that it kills jobs, then it is our responsibility to make sure that we give our small businesses in this country relief.

Mr. Speaker, I have been here for a little over a year and I realize there is a fourth branch of government. Now, we all know what the Constitution says. It is that Congress, the legislative branch, creates the laws. The administrative branch, the White House, implements the laws that we create. If there is a question, then we get the referee involved, the courts. However, there is a fourth branch of government that is unconstitutional. It is called the professional regulator.

Now, what has happened over the course of these past years is that the administrative branch wants to send directions to their regulators to put more and more pressure on our business community that creates jobs and gives our families opportunities.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maine an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. POLIQUIN. One of those agencies is the Financial Stability Oversight Council. Mr. Speaker, this organization has tremendous power on our economy to regulate financial institutions that pose no risk to the economy, like credit unions in northern Maine and small community banks in northern Maine that did not cause the problems that we have had over these past years.

However, all I am asking and all this bill does is make sure that the Financial Stability Oversight Council's operations are funded by the people's representatives. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have the opportunity to fund that operation.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maine an additional 10 seconds.

□ 1430

Mr. POLIQUIN. We only want to make sure that there is enough time for public comment. I ask everybody to support this bill. It is a great bill, and it keeps money flowing through the economy for our small businesses and job creators.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the chairman. I thank my colleague from Minnesota, Representative EMMER, for offering this piece of legislation that is under consideration today.

Mr. Speaker, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act places the FSOC and the Office of Financial Research under the regular appropriations process and will require the Office of Financial Research to submit activity reports to Congress. Bringing FSOC under the appropriations process ensures greater accountability for a council that has continuously failed to fully disclose its SIFI designation methodology and that has yet to provide concrete guidelines for designated entities to lose their SIFI status.

Most importantly, this legislation will bring much-needed transparency to the Council. FSOC is intended to be a forum for discussion and analysis of financial regulator issues, but, unfortunately, the Council has continually failed to address the consolidation and failure of our Main Street banks. On its own, a single community bank failure will not pose a systemic risk to the financial system. However, losing these small banks at an accelerating pace is a clear warning signal that the financial system is not healthy, and losing community banks as a whole certainly qualifies as systemically risky.

Instead of closed-door deliberations, the Council, which is made up of financial regulators who have been acknowledging this exact problem, should be working to address this pressing issue in a transparent manner before it is too late. This legislation is a logical next step in reforming the Financial Stability Oversight Council to ensure that it actually addresses threats to our financial system.

I am happy to lend my support to this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense measure.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his efforts on this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on both sides, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 8¼ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I begin my remarks with just a clarification of the argument of my friends on the other side of the aisle. Their argument is essentially this: that Federal regulators—banking regulators—cannot do their jobs if their funding is somehow held accountable to the American people. This argument ignores some important facts.

While Dodd-Frank may well have been intended to protect consumers and end Big Government bailouts, FSOC's authority to arbitrarily designate nonbank financial institutions as systemically important undermines the original intent of the law. In fact, just last month, a U.S. court rescinded MetLife's SIFI designation. The opinion called FSOC's determination process "fatally flawed," and it called the insurer's designation "capricious and arbitrary." Again, those are not my words, those are a Federal judge's words. In effect, the judge confirmed what House Republicans have been saying for years—that the FSOC is out of control and requires additional congressional oversight.

That is why I support this commonsense and, frankly, modest legislation, which subjects FSOC and the Office of Financial Research to the annual appropriations process and common practice reporting requirements.

We all want to hold financial providers accountable to their customers. It is also Congress' responsibility to hold our government accountable to the American people. This bill helps make that happen, and we should all be able to agree to that.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to take a moment and talk about why we created the FSOC and the OFR in the very first place since my Republican colleagues seem to think that more regulatory cooperation and the overseeing of our financial system is such a bad thing.

Simply put, we created FSOC to look across regulatory silos and detect, prevent, and mitigate systemic risk in the U.S. financial system so that we would never again be caught off guard when major financial firms, like AIG, fail.

Recall that AIG created an entire business model that was designed to avoid regulation, which sent its major operations and risky credit default swaps to the London-based unit, AIG Financial Products, which, in turn, was guaranteed by the U.S. parent company. What is more, AIG was allowed to select as a regulator the Office of Thrift Supervision, OTS.

According to the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, which is the FCIC,

the OTS failed to effectively exercise its authority over AIG and its affiliates. It lacked the capability to supervise an institution of the size and complexity of AIG's. It did not recognize the risk inherent in AIG's sales of credit default swaps, and it did not understand its responsibility to oversee the entire company, including AIG Financial Products.

As we all know, this regulatory arbitrage ultimately spelled failure for AIG because its enormous sales of credit default swaps were made without putting up initial collateral, setting aside capital reserves, or hedging its exposure—a profound failure in corporate governance, particularly in its risk management practices.

In having just witnessed the takeover of Merrill Lynch by Bank of America and the bankruptcy of Lehman Brothers a mere 24 hours before, the U.S. Government stepped in and committed more than \$180 billion to ensure that AIG's collapse didn't bring down the rest of the financial system to which it was so interconnected. From there, the Bush administration requested the authority to bail out the big banks.

When the dust began to settle, Democrats in Congress worked to come up with a solution to eliminate this regulatory arbitrage and encourage our financial regulators to communicate with one another. Of course, the commonsense solution was to create a council on which each of our financial regulators had a voice and could meet to consider gaps between the agencies' interconnectedness within the financial sector. This council would also hold each regulator accountable to how the regulators as a whole were mitigating systemic risk to our economy.

To help inform and support the council, we created the Office of Financial Research to research and report on potential systemic risk to our economy. Dodd-Frank ensured that the council of the OFR and that Congress would all be focused on emerging threats to our economy and would never be caught unawares by another AIG. H.R. 3340, however, undermines these reforms, and it should be opposed.

Mr. Speaker and Members, many of the Members on the opposite side of the aisle are talking about our oversight responsibility, but they don't even exercise oversight responsibility or get the regulators in and have a real discussion with them about how it all works. AIG was complicated. None of the Members of Congress really understood how it operated, how it was formed, how it was set up, and what it was doing. We have learned our lesson from AIG, and I hope that the Members of this Congress will not forget it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT).

Mr. TROTT. I thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak in support of the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is just one more step in our continued effort to rein in out-of-control regulatory bodies that are products of the Dodd-Frank Act. FSOC and the Office of Financial Research, which are both products of Dodd-Frank, have the power to obtain sensitive information and are tasked with the mission of monitoring the financial stability of the United States.

With such a broad mandate and vast authority, it is appalling that these bodies are not subject to the congressional appropriations process and must satisfy only minimal reporting requirements. OFR states that its job is to shine light in the dark corners of the financial system, but it operates in the dark corners, itself, as it spends funds that have been obtained from fees on an ever-expanding workforce and budget, all outside of the appropriations process and all outside of the eyes of our citizens.

The people of this great Nation deserve a transparent Federal Government that answers to them. Some here today have suggested that, in this bill, we want to put a blindfold on—stop oversight and ignore a future financial crisis. We have a blindfold on now. We are all in the dark. We don't want to stop oversight. We just want to exercise our responsibilities under Article I of the Constitution.

Some here today have suggested that Congress is no longer capable of exercising its Article I powers and that, therefore, FSOC must be independent of the appropriations process. To them, I ask: Why should Washington bureaucrats have more power over the financial decisions of the American people than their elected Representatives?

This legislation is a commonsense solution, and I urge its passage.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Under Democratic leadership, our country has made tremendous strides in creating jobs, in growing the economy, and in stabilizing the housing market since the depths of the 2008 recession. This was despite significant headwinds from both overseas crises and Republican intransigence. Instrumental to our achievements is the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, which has bolstered our Nation's financial stability and has brought accountability to the entire system.

Among its many accomplishments, such as protecting consumers from predatory practices, Dodd-Frank sought to address the excessive risk taking by the largest and most complex financial institutions by creating the Financial Stability Oversight Council—that is FSOC—and the Office of Financial Research, OFR. These two agencies were charged with looking at the big picture and identifying cracks in the system that could cause a break-

down in our economy. They oversee all aspects of the financial system and our largest institutions that can cause systemic risk.

FSOC works to identify and to address systemic risk posed by large, complex companies and activities before they threaten the stability of the economy. It provides for the cooperation and information sharing between agencies in order to research and correct threats before they become crises. OFR helps to provide the necessary tools to FSOC by collecting and analyzing data on the health of our financial markets and by conducting research on potential sources of financial instability. It flags emerging threats and shares that information with other regulators so that they can intervene before a crisis occurs.

Together, these two agencies have addressed the devastating, widespread failures in supervision and regulation that brought our economy to its knees in 2008. They fill the regulatory gaps to make sure that no institution, however powerful, can circumvent our rules and regulations.

This crucial work is supported by a majority of Americans—Republicans and Democrats—who favor Dodd-Frank and the reforms it has implemented. Yet, instead of recognizing the importance of these institutions and the interests of the American public, House Republicans are undermining our regulators' efforts to the benefit of the industries that are lining their own pockets. I am troubled by the amnesia that plagues my colleagues about the causes of the 2008 financial crisis and why Wall Street reform was so critical.

We created FSOC and OFR because our fractured regulatory system allowed firms to skirt the rules of the road. This behavior left millions homeless and unemployed, and it plunged us into the worst recession since the Great Depression. What is worse is that hundreds of communities across the country are still struggling to recover.

□ 1445

By cutting off FSOC and OFR's independent funding streams, H.R. 3340 will subject the agencies to the volatility of the congressional appropriations process and the same funding uncertainty faced by the SEC and the FCFTC.

Make no mistake. The bill before us today is part of a concerted effort by House Republicans to impede the progress of financial reform.

Yesterday Republicans passed a bill in committee to repeal the only mechanism to unwind a megabank without destabilizing the economy as well as a bill to eliminate funding for the bureau tasked with protecting consumers from predatory loans.

Earlier today and for much of this month, committee Republicans will depose public servants at the CFPB, Treasury, and FSOC, despite agencies providing thousands of pages of documents at the Republicans' request. Soon I expect my chairman to bring up bills repealing the rest of our reform.

Democrats in the House are all too familiar with these attacks. Are we not? Republicans have proposed \$6 trillion in cuts to initiatives like Medicare, Medicaid, and food stamps. They have prevented us from debating America's sacred right to vote. Most Republicans voted against upholding the full faith and credit of our Nation's debt. I could go on and on and on.

So, to my colleagues, we have pulled the cover off of them, and we are pointing out to you in no uncertain terms how they are singularly focused on killing Dodd-Frank reforms.

They are not exercising their oversight responsibility. They are determined that they are going to have their way, and they have it under the banner of overregulation.

Well, that old argument is tired, ladies and gentlemen. Overregulation every time they want to do something for the big banks, et cetera.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this coordinated attack and vote "no" on this harmful bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining.

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

It has been a fascinating debate on a very, very simple bill. H.R. 3340 from the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) does one very simple thing.

It says two Federal agencies—the Office of Financial Research and the Financial Stability Oversight Council—have to go through the budgeted appropriations process. It says nothing more. It says nothing less.

Right now these agencies write their own budget. They can write a budget for \$100 million. They can write a budget for \$500 million. They can write a budget for \$10 billion.

Legally, they can write a budget for trillions of dollars. They can take money away from we, the people, and there is absolutely nothing Congress can do.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress who has come here has raised their hand and, in their oath of office, they solemnly swear to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. I wonder how many Members reflect upon that solemn oath.

Because Article I, section 9, clause 7, of the Constitution says: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ."

Yet, theoretically, what has happened here is this power of the purse, a critical power of Article I of the Constitution, has been outsourced to Article II.

It is fascinating, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure there is a more solemn responsibility of the Federal Government than to provide for the common defense.

Yet, we don't allow the Pentagon to write their own budget. It has to go

through the elected representatives of we, the people.

The Justice Department: We don't allow them to write their own budget. It has to go through the elected representatives of we, the people.

Even the Office of the President: The President is not allowed to write his own budget. It has to go through the appropriations process of the elected representatives of we, the people.

So we have two incredibly important and powerful Federal agencies that get to write their own budget. They get to take money away from hardworking Americans to essentially do what they please. This is not Article I of the Constitution.

Madison, in Federalist 47—I may not have the quote down perfectly—essentially said that the common notion of legislative, executive, and judicial power in one hand is the absolute definition of tyranny.

So we have in a Federal agency the FSOC, part of this shadow regulatory system that the American people have come to loathe, that has the ability to designate financial firms too big to fail and then allow them to be bailed out with taxpayer funds, to be functionally micromanaged by Federal agencies, essentially, a Federal takeover of the banking system so there can be a political allocation of credit, which is what led to the economic crisis in the first place: politicizing credit, mandating, forcing, suggesting, cajoling financial institutions to loan money to people to buy homes they couldn't afford to keep. Think Fannie. Think Freddie.

So we believe on this side of the aisle, regardless of which party is in power in Congress, regardless of which party is in power in the White House, that Federal agencies ought to be funded through Article I of the Constitution and be accountable to we, the people. It is that simple.

So the ranking member says: Well, we can't hold them to the volatility and uncertainty of this congressional appropriations process. Funny, the Pentagon is. Funny, the President is. Funny, the FBI is.

You know, if you don't like democracy, maybe it is the worst form of government, save every other form of government, but it is our form of government. And our Constitution is the bedrock of our freedom and our prosperity, and these out-of-control agencies ought to be accountable and they ought to be transparent to we, the people.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), H.R. 3340, and bring accountability and transparency and fidelity to the Constitution back to this institution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF THE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL RESEARCH.

Section 153 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5343), as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) ADDITIONAL DUTIES.—

“(1) ANNUAL WORK PLAN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall, after a period of 60 days for public notice and comment, annually publish a detailed work plan concerning the priorities of the Office for the upcoming fiscal year.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The work plan shall include the following:

“(i) A unique alphanumeric identifier and detailed description of any report, study, working paper, grant, guidance, data collection, or request for information that is expected to be in progress during, or scheduled to begin in, the upcoming fiscal year.

“(ii) For each item listed under clause (i), a target date for any significant actions related to such item, including the target date—

“(I) for the release of a report, study, or working paper;

“(II) for, and topics of, a meeting of a working paper group and each solicitation of applications for grants; and

“(III) for the issuance of guidance, data collections, or requests for information.

“(iii) A list of all technical and professional advisory committees that is expected to be convened in the upcoming fiscal year pursuant to section 152(h).

“(iv) The name and professional affiliations of each individual who served during the previous fiscal year as an academic or professional fellow pursuant to section 152(i).

“(v) A detailed description of the progress made by primary financial regulatory agencies in adopting a unique alphanumeric system to identify legally distinct entities that engage in financial transactions (commonly known as a ‘Legal Entity Identifier’), including a list of regulations requiring the use of such a system and actions taken to ensure the adoption of such a system by primary financial regulatory agencies.

“(2) PUBLIC REPORTS.—

“(A) CONSULTATION.—In preparing any public report with respect to a specified entity, class of entities, or financial product or service, the Director shall consult with any Federal department or agency with expertise in regulating the entity, class of entities, or financial product or service.

“(B) REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—A public report described in subparagraph (A) shall include—

“(i) an explanation of any changes made as a result of a consultation under this subparagraph and, with respect to any changes suggested in such consultation that were not made, the reasons that the Director did not incorporate such changes; and

“(ii) information on the date, time, and nature of such consultation.

“(C) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—Before issuing any public report described in subparagraph (A), the Director shall provide a period of 90 days for public notice and comment on the report.

“(3) CYBERSECURITY PLAN.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Office shall develop and implement a cybersecurity plan that uses appropriate safeguards that are adequate to protect the integrity and confidentiality of the data in the possession of the Office.

“(B) GAO REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall annually audit the cybersecurity plan and its implementation described in subparagraph (A).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 671, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this amendment to the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act, which mirrors bipartisan legislation I have authored, the Office of Financial Research Accountability Act.

A more open, collaborative, and cyber-secure Office of Financial Research would be better positioned to achieve its stated mission of promoting financial stability. So, basically, this amendment gets the Office of Financial Research on track with a few simple, reasonable reforms. There are three of them.

First, it requires the OFR to submit an annual work plan that details the Office's upcoming work while making it available for public notice and comment.

Second, it requires the Office to coordinate with financial regulators and agencies that have subject matter experience as it prepares public reports.

Third, it also tasks the Office, which handles immense amounts of sensitive financial data, with formulating a cybersecurity plan.

So this amendment strengthens the Office of Financial Research's ability to ensure a transparent, efficient, and stable financial system for the American people, the core objective of the Office.

I thank Mr. EMMER of Minnesota for his work on this important issue. I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support both my amendment and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Royce amendment, which the Financial Services Committee considered last November as H.R. 3738. The amendment is yet further evidence of the Republican plan to kill Dodd-Frank with a thousand cuts.

If adopted, the Office of Financial Research would have to disclose its research agenda at the beginning of each year, potentially alarming markets, just as the underlying bill, the Royce amendment, would mean that any study of the OFR would become corrupted.

Our market actors would see that the OFR, an office that makes rec-

ommendations to the Financial Stability Oversight Council about systemic risks, was concerned about a particular topic.

In response, those actors would begin to change their behavior even if the OFR might later conclude that there was never any risks to our economy.

In addition, this amendment would require OFR to go into great detail when disclosing what it plans to study, something that is not done by any other research organization.

Finally, I am troubled by the amendment's provisions requiring the OFR to disclose its consultations. Internal consultations and deliberations are explicitly excluded by the Freedom of Information Act and for good reason. Individuals would not likely participate in OFR studies if their offline, candid remarks were made part of the public record.

Will this prevent industry lobbyists and trade associations from commenting? Of course not. They will continue earning their keep, and the amendment gives them even more opportunities.

Why would independent researchers, academics, and scientists want to weigh in on a public fight? This amendment, the underlying bill, and many of the other Republican initiatives we have seen this year all share the same goal. They are aimed at undoing all of the progress the Obama administration and Democrats have made in the last 8 years.

How many times are we going to find ways to kill financial reform? How many times are we going to vote to kill job-creating agencies, like the Export-Import Bank? How many times are we going to vote to get rid of ObamaCare and the health insurance of millions of Americans?

There is important work to be done, passing a budget, for one, ending homelessness in America, funding the administration's requests to help combat the Zika virus, helping Puerto Rico to restructure their crippling debt so that the island can grow and prosper and create jobs.

When are Republicans going to hear the cries of everyday Americans?

I encourage Members to support their constituents by continuing to fight for these issues and oppose Republican attempts like this to simply roll back Democrat reform.

I urge a “no” vote on the Royce amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my good friend from California.

The Office of Financial Research, the OFR, is an important entity, but its work so far has been very, very disappointing.

It is so disappointing that a landmark study by OFR on asset management has been publicly criticized by a

member of FSOC, the SEC, who took the unusual step of opening its own comment period on the report.

We must make sure that OFR's research is done in the right way with a strategic plan and that OFR consults with experts and gives proper public notice and involvement.

We don't want the Financial Stability Oversight Council, the FSOC, one of the most critical and sensitive creations in Dodd-Frank, relying on offhand work criticized publicly by institutions across this city and country.

Further, their data collection requirements and responsibilities bring concern to all of our citizens. As we have seen with the IRS, the OPM, the CFPB, and now the OFR, rising concern over the importance of cybersecurity and data protection are noted in this act and are an important part of Mr. ROYCE's amendment.

□ 1500

Many of our Federal agencies are the root cause of cyber breach and loss of privacy, and we don't want to see that extended here.

I support the amendment and the bill, and I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague from California, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Ed ROYCE, for offering his amendment to the FSOC Reform Act.

As we have seen time and time again, our government needs to improve security procedures in order to protect the privacy of the American people and integrity for business. The burden, Mr. Speaker, is on the Federal Government to provide a plan and to be transparent about what it does with the information it collects.

This amendment accomplishes both of these goals at the Office of Financial Research. By mandating OFR to submit an annual work plan and allow for public notice and comment, the American people will have a greater voice in shaping the objectives of OFR. Perhaps most importantly, requiring Federal regulators to collaborate on data security will make the personal and financial information of all Americans more secure.

Again, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE for offering this amendment. I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear about what this proposal does and does not do. Nothing in this amendment says that the Office of Financial Research must amend their work product because of public comments provided to them. The amendment here simply ensures that the public gets a chance to comment.

I have asked eight—eight—FSOC members about their potential opposition to this idea. Not a single one has raised an objection to this. As to any

rhetoric in opposition to this amendment, a lot of it has centered on the potential of opening up the Office of Financial Research to inappropriate influence. Nothing could be further from reality.

Inappropriate influence is what happens when you labor long with little or no transparency, not when you provides more sunlight. What this amendment does is provides that transparency. It provides that sunlight by opening that up.

There has been considerable, warranted criticism from those across the ideological spectrum about the quality of the OFR's research. We are taking a step today to improve the Office of Financial Research's research practices, something integral to FSOC reform as the Council makes designation decisions founded on the Office's work.

Regulators making decisions on financial stability should do so with their eyes wide open. A more transparent, collaborative, and cyber secure Office of Financial Research accomplishes that end. For that reason, I urge Members from both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Moore moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3340 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. ____ Upon enactment of this Act it shall be in order to consider in the House of Representatives the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 125) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question

shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and on any amendment thereto to adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Ms. MOORE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today is April 14, and, by law, Congress must enact a budget resolution by tomorrow, April 15. I repeat, Mr. Speaker: by law, Congress must enact a budget resolution by April 15. That is tomorrow.

After months and months and months of the majority promising regular order, the Republican House leadership has failed to meet this most basic measure of responsibility of bringing a budget to the floor. So today, Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit will help out my Republican colleagues with their responsibilities to this body.

In my motion to recommit, I am offering up the Republican budget that was passed out of committee last month to allow my colleagues the ability to vote on their own budget and also to allow us to offer our alternatives.

To refresh your memory, Mr. Speaker, the GOP budget resolution ends the Medicare guarantee, makes \$6.5 trillion in drastic cuts, increases poverty, and erodes the economic security of all Americans.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as awful as Democrats think that this budget is, the Tea Party faction of the House GOP is demanding that we make even more draconian cuts and even deeper cuts, and they ought to have the right, as well, to offer their alternative on the floor.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker. I don't support this Republican budget, but I am offering this motion to recommit because, again, we cannot offer our alternative unless this budget is processed on this floor.

The Republicans are abandoning their promise to restore regular order because they can't agree on a worse product, but hardworking families deserve a Congress that invests in their future, protects their safety, and creates a level playing field for them and their children to succeed.

You know what they always say, Mr. Speaker: the majority gets its way, and the minority gets its say. Let's get to the "have its say" part.

We are going to continue as Democrats to press for a budget that creates jobs, opportunities, and raises pay-

checks for the American people while reducing the deficit in a balanced and responsible way, Mr. Speaker.

But, again, since the Republicans can't seem to get their act together by bringing their budget to the floor, my motion to recommit would bring that product to the floor. So that is why I am offering this motion to recommit today, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order because the instruction contains matter in the jurisdiction of a committee to which the bill was not referred, thus violating clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires an amendment to be germane to the measure being amended. Committee jurisdiction is a central test of germaneness, and I am afraid I must insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would just mention that I think it is germane because tomorrow is April 15.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no other Member wishing to be heard on the point of order, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin are not germane.

Clause 7 of rule XVI—the germaneness rule—provides that no proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

One of the central tenets of the germaneness rule is that an amendment may not introduce matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the pending measure.

The bill, H.R. 3340, as amended, addresses funding and other matters relating to the Financial Stability Oversight Council and the Office of Financial Research, which are matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services.

The instructions in the motion to recommit propose an amendment consisting of a special order of business of the House, which is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules.

As the Chair ruled in similar proceedings on October 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 14, 2013, the instructions in the motion to recommit are not germane because they are not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services.

Accordingly, the motion to recommit is not germane. The point of order is sustained, and the motion is not in order.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, and the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if arising without further proceedings in recommittal; adoption of amendment No. 1 to H.R. 3791; the motion to recommit H.R. 3791, if ordered; and passage of H.R. 3791, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 176, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—239

Abraham	Forbes	Love
Aderholt	Fortenberry	Lucas
Amash	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Amodei	Franks (AZ)	Lummis
Babin	Frelinghuysen	MacArthur
Barletta	Garrett	Marino
Barr	Gibbs	Massie
Barton	Gibson	McCarthy
Benishek	Gohmert	McCaul
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	McClintock
Bishop (MI)	Gosar	McHenry
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	McKinley
Black	Granger	McMorris
Blackburn	Graves (GA)	Rodgers
Blum	Graves (LA)	McSally
Bost	Graves (MO)	Meadows
Boustany	Griffith	Meehan
Brady (TX)	Grothman	Messer
Brat	Guinta	Mica
Bridenstine	Guthrie	Miller (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Hanna	Miller (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Hardy	Moolenaar
Buchanan	Harper	Mooney (WV)
Buck	Harris	Mullin
Bucshon	Hartzler	Mulvaney
Burgess	Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)
Byrne	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Calvert	Herrera Beutler	Newhouse
Carter (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Noem
Carter (TX)	Hill	Nugent
Chabot	Holding	Nunes
Chaffetz	Hudson	Olson
Clawson (FL)	Huelskamp	Palazzo
Coffman	Huizenga (MI)	Palmer
Cole	Hultgren	Paulsen
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Pearce
Collins (NY)	Hurd (TX)	Perry
Comstock	Hurt (VA)	Pittenger
Conaway	Issa	Pitts
Cook	Jenkins (KS)	Poliquin
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (WV)	Pompeo
Cramer	Johnson (OH)	Posey
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Price, Tom
Crenshaw	Jolly	Ratcliffe
Culberson	Jones	Reed
Curbelo (FL)	Jordan	Reichert
Davis, Rodney	Joyce	Renacci
Denham	Katko	Ribble
Dent	Kelly (MS)	Rice (SC)
DeSantis	Kelly (PA)	Rigell
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Roby
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Dold	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Donovan	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Duffy	Knight	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Rokita
Ellmers (NC)	LaHood	Rooney (FL)
Emmer (MN)	LaMalfa	Ros-Lehtinen
Farenthold	Lamborn	Roskam
Fincher	Lance	Ross
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Rothfus
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Rouzer
Fleming	Long	Royce
Flores	Loudermilk	Russell

Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers

Adams
Agullar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.

Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Allen
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Delaney
Duncan (SC)
Engel
Fattah

Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)

NAYS—176

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano

NOT VOTING—18

Lieu, Ted
Maloney,
Carolyn
Marchant
Nadler
Payne
Poe (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

So the motion to table was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 145, I was unavoidably detained.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 179, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—239

Abraham	Forbes	Lummis
Aderholt	Fortenberry	MacArthur
Allen	Fox	Marino
Amash	Franks (AZ)	Massie
Amodei	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy
Babin	Garrett	McCaul
Barletta	Gibbs	McClintock
Barr	Gibson	McHenry
Barton	Gohmert	McKinley
Benishek	Goodlatte	McSally
Bilirakis	Gosar	Meadows
Bishop (MI)	Gowdy	Meehan
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Messer
Black	Graves (GA)	Mica
Blackburn	Graves (LA)	Miller (FL)
Blum	Graves (MO)	Miller (MI)
Bost	Griffith	Moolenaar
Boustany	Grothman	Mooney (WV)
Brady (TX)	Guinta	Mullin
Brat	Guthrie	Mulvaney
Bridenstine	Hanna	Murphy (PA)
Brooks (AL)	Hardy	Neugebauer
Brooks (IN)	Harper	Newhouse
Buchanan	Harris	Noem
Buck	Hartzler	Nugent
Bucshon	Heck (NV)	Nunes
Burgess	Hensarling	Olson
Byrne	Herrera Beutler	Palazzo
Calvert	Hice, Jody B.	Palmer
Carter (GA)	Hill	Paulsen
Carter (TX)	Holding	Pearce
Chabot	Hudson	Perry
Chaffetz	Huelskamp	Pittenger
Clawson (FL)	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Coffman	Hultgren	Poliquin
Cole	Hunter	Pompeo
Collins (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Posey
Collins (NY)	Hurt (VA)	Price, Tom
Comstock	Issa	Ratcliffe
Conaway	Jenkins (KS)	Reed
Cook	Jenkins (WV)	Reichert
Costello (PA)	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Cramer	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Crawford	Jolly	Rice (SC)
Crenshaw	Jordan	Rigell
Cuellar	Joyce	Roby
Culberson	Katko	Roe (TN)
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Denham	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Dent	King (NY)	Rokita
DeSantis	Kinzinger (IL)	Rooney (FL)
DesJarlais	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Knight	Roskam
Dold	Labrador	Ross
Donovan	LaHood	Rothfus
Duffy	LaMalfa	Rouzer
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Royce
Ellmers (NC)	Lance	Russell
Emmer (MN)	Latta	Salmon
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Sanford
Fincher	Long	Scalise
Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk	Schweikert
Fleischmann	Love	Scott, Austin
Fleming	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Sessions

□ 1532

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Messrs. RANGEL, LARSEN of Washington, and JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott

Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

NOT VOTING—15

Delaney
Duncan (SC)
Engel
Fattah
Lieu, Ted
Maloney,
Carolyn

Marchant
McMorris
Rodgers
Nadler
Payne
Poe (TX)
Simpson

Smith (NE)
Tonko
Wasserman
Schultz

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 146, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 146, the vote on final passage of H.R. 3340, the Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)

Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey

Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—253

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Becerra
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Eilmlers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

Grayson
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
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
Perlmutter
Perry
Petterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

RAISING CONSOLIDATED ASSETS THRESHOLD UNDER SMALL BANK HOLDING COMPANY POLICY STATEMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. KELLY OF ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the adoption of amendment No. 1 on the bill (H.R. 3791) to raise the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) on which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 165, nays 253, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—165

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell

Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
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)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis

Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader

Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
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)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis

Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader

Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
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)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1539

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

NOT VOTING—15

Delaney	Maloney,	Poe (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Carolyn	Ruppersberger
Engel	Marchant	Simpson
Fattah	Nadler	Tonko
Lieu, Ted	Payne	Wasserman
	Pelosi	Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1545

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MOORE. I am opposed.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Moore moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3791 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. ____ Upon enactment of this Act it shall be in order to consider in the House of Representatives the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 125) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and on any amendment thereto to adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Mr. HENSARLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today is April 14. Tomorrow, by law, our budget resolution is due to be passed on the floor of the House.

Now, we have heard a great deal from the majority about the need to return to regular order, and regular order would require us to pass this bill either

today or by tomorrow. So since that bill is not before us, my motion to recommit would give us an opportunity to vote on the Republican budget resolution that was passed out of our committee just last month.

Now, I just want to refresh your memory, Mr. Speaker. The GOP budget resolution ends the Medicare guarantee, makes \$6.5 trillion in drastic cuts, increases poverty, and erodes the economic security of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, as awful as this is, there is a faction over there among the Tea Party Republicans who want the opportunity to make it even worse than it is. But they can't submit their awful, worse bill, just like Democrats can't offer their alternative bill, until we get the Republican budget on the floor.

So by Republicans abandoning their promise to return us to regular order and to pass a budget, it is ridiculous for us to be passing these bills. Mr. Speaker, how can we talk about subjecting FSOC, for example, to the appropriations process? We can't really do these appropriations bills without a budget.

Hardworking families deserve to see where we stand on these budgets, and Democrats want to have our say. I get it. The majority gets its way, but the minority gets its say. Let's get on to the “gets its say” part.

Mr. Speaker, you guys can't get your act together. My motion to recommit would put that budget on the floor right now, and Republicans would have the opportunity to pass their bill, and then we have the opportunity to offer up our alternative.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order because the instruction contains matter in the jurisdiction of a committee to which the bill was not referred, thus violating clause 7 of rule XVI which requires an amendment to be germane to the measure being amended. Committee jurisdiction is a central test of germaneness, and I must insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin are not germane.

The bill, H.R. 3791, addresses a Federal Reserve System policy statement relating to small bank holding companies, which is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services.

The instructions in the motion to recommit propose an amendment consisting of a special order of business of the House, which is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules.

For the reasons stated by the Chair earlier today, the motion to recommit is not germane. The point of order is sustained. The motion is not in order.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 177, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

AYES—241

Abraham	Duffy	Joyce
Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	Katko
Allen	Ellmers (NC)	Kelly (MS)
Amash	Emmer (MN)	Kelly (PA)
Amodei	Farenthold	King (IA)
Babin	Fincher	King (NY)
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Barr	Fleischmann	Kline
Barton	Fleming	Knight
Benishek	Flores	Labrador
Bilirakis	Forbes	LaHood
Bishop (MI)	Fortenberry	LaMalfa
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Lamborn
Black	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Blum	Garrett	LoBiondo
Bost	Gibbs	Long
Boustany	Gibson	Loudermilk
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Love
Brat	Goodlatte	Lucas
Bridenstine	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (AL)	Gowdy	Lummis
Brooks (IN)	Granger	MacArthur
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	Marino
Buck	Graves (LA)	Massie
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Burgess	Griffith	McCaul
Byrne	Grothman	McClintock
Calvert	Guinta	McHenry
Carter (GA)	Guthrie	McKinley
Carter (TX)	Hanna	McMorris
Chabot	Hardy	Rodgers
Chaffetz	Harper	McSally
Clawson (FL)	Harris	Meadows
Coffman	Hartzler	Meehan
Cohen	Heck (NV)	Messer
Cole	Hensarling	Mica
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)
Collins (NY)	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (MI)
Comstock	Hill	Moolenaar
Conaway	Holding	Mooney (WV)
Cook	Hudson	Mullin
Costello (PA)	Huelskamp	Mulvaney
Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Crawford	Hultgren	Neugebauer
Crenshaw	Hunter	Newhouse
Culberson	Hurd (TX)	Noem
Curbelo (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Nugent
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Nunes
Denham	Jenkins (KS)	Olson
Dent	Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo
DeSantis	Johnson (OH)	Palmer
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Paulsen
Diaz-Balart	Jolly	Pearce
Dold	Jones	Perry
Donovan	Jordan	Pittenger

Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce

Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton

Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)

Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Delaney
Duncan (SC)
Engel
Fattah
Lieu, Ted

Maloney,
Carolyn
Marchant
Nadler
Payne
Pelosi

Poe (TX)
Simpson
Tonko
Wasserman
Schultz
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1610

Mr. SCALISE and Ms. FOXX changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 171, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

YEAS—247

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

Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxo
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Paulsen
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood

LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
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
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher

Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker

NAYS—171

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton

Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
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)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Delaney
Duncan (SC)
Engel
Fattah
Lieu, Ted

Maloney,
Carolyn
Marchant
Nadler
Payne
Pelosi

Poe (TX)
Simpson
Tonko
Wasserman
Schultz
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Mississippi) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1617

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 2016, I was absent and was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 145—"Yea."

Rollcall No. 146—"Yea."

Rollcall No. 147—"Nay."

Rollcall No. 148—"Yea."

Rollcall No. 149—"Yea."

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THE CHIBOK SCHOOLGIRLS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we stand to remember the nearly 300 Chibok girls who were kidnapped by Boko Haram on April 14, 2014—2 years ago—from their school in Nigeria.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram has no regard for human life, and it is wreaking havoc on the citizens of northern Nigeria. As Boko Haram commits acts of genocide that will take generations to recover from, the world stays silent. Their daily horrors include killing Christians, killing Muslims who do not agree with them, beheading and slaughtering boys, kidnapping and raping women and girls, selling them as sex slaves, and using them as suicide bombers. Human trafficking is their specialty. Boko Haram believes that Western education is sin.

We will never forget the schoolgirls. We will never forget the Chibok girls. We will tweet, wear red, and we look for them no matter how long it takes. We will never give up until we find them.

Let us bow our heads in a moment of silence.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT A BIG WIN FOR SENIORS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to applaud the bipartisan efforts to support our seniors through the passage of the Older Americans Act, legislation that I have supported. Our seniors have spent their lives working hard, raising their families, and giving back to their communities. The Older Americans Act shows what we can do when we work together.

The bill improves services for seniors, especially those with the greatest social and economic needs. For example, it provides funding for the popular Meals on Wheels program. The bill saves taxpayers money by preventing very costly hospital readmissions and by helping senior citizens stay in their homes and communities. It also supports programs to prevent the abuse and neglect of senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the Older Americans Act is a big, bipartisan win for our Nation's seniors. I encourage the President to sign the bill as soon as it hits his desk.

FIND THE CHIBOK GIRLS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in the dark of night on this very day 2 years ago, young girls at the early ages of 11 to 17 were in nightgowns, preparing for sleep, and were getting ready for the exams that would open the doors of opportunity, as they were told by their Nigerian parents. One daughter had rushed back to the school from a weekend trip because her father said: You shouldn't be home. You must go and take your exam.

That night, terrorists came and rounded them up and threatened them and took them into the dark of the Nigerian bush in Borno State, upwards of Abuja. They have now been gone for 2 years, the Chibok girls.

I stood alongside FREDERICA WILSON and LOIS FRANKEL when we went to Nigeria within weeks of their kidnapping. Boko Haram, which is now ISIL, and ISIL, which is now Boko Haram—the most dangerous terrorist group in the world—will come to the shores of America if we are not vigilant to find them and quash them.

We must find the Chibok girls. They deserve our constant refrain and study to realize that it is terrorists who took them. We must bring the terrorists down and find the Chibok girls to take them to their families.

NATIONAL RETIREMENT PLANNING WEEK

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize April 11 through 15 as National Retirement Planning Week.

Saving for retirement is one of the most important steps that Americans can take to build a better future for themselves and their children. Unfortunately, too often, saving for retirement remains a distant goal that is put off in exchange for more immediate needs. A GAO report released last year found that, among households with those aged 55 and older, roughly 29 percent have no retirement savings or a defined benefit plan. With this in mind, it must be a national priority for us to communicate the importance of retirement planning. By encouraging more Americans to adequately prepare for their retirement years, we can significantly enhance retirement security in the United States.

Recognizing this week as National Retirement Planning Week is an important step in helping to raise awareness of this need, and I commend the

members of the National Retirement Planning Coalition for their efforts in educating Americans about the importance of retirement planning.

I wish you all the best as you continue this valued campaign.

TRINIDAD GARZA HIGH SCHOOL RECEIVES ACT AWARD

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Trinidad Garza Early College High School, in Dallas, for receiving the 2016 ACT High School Exemplar in College and Career Readiness Award.

Since 2013, the annual ACT College and Career Readiness Campaign has recognized participating high schools and community colleges for their outstanding efforts in education. The prestigious award is presented to only one school per State that demonstrates exceptional efforts in preparing students for college and career readiness. Given Trinidad Garza's commitment to preparing students for success in higher education and the workforce, this accolade is well-deserved. The award also celebrates individual students within participating schools for their outstanding progress on their ACT scores, such as Trinidad Garza seniors Paola Soto, Ivan Gonzales, Barry Levine, and Lizbeth Garcia.

I am extremely proud of Trinidad Garza Early College High School for representing the State of Texas and the 33rd Congressional District.

You are an example of what a dedicated group of educators can accomplish when it is committed to empowering its students.

Once again, congratulations to everyone at Trinidad Garza Early College High School, and keep up the good work.

CONGRATULATIONS TO OAKLAND COUNTY SHERIFF MIKE BOUCHARD

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share the outstanding accomplishments of Oakland County Sheriff Mike Bouchard, who was recently awarded the esteemed Ferris E. Lucas Award of 2016 for Sheriff of the Year from the National Sheriffs' Association.

As a lifelong resident of Oakland County, I can tell you that our sheriff's department is well-known around the country because of the outstanding work by Sheriff Bouchard and his world-class team of dedicated deputies. He is the kind of leader all families want to keep their families safe. I have known Mike Bouchard for many years, and I know that, every day, he looks forward to going to work to serve the men and women of our local communities, and he does an outstanding job

of it in utilizing his professionalism and compassion for people.

In serving Oakland County for over 17 years, Mike Bouchard was selected among a field of more than 3,000 sheriffs for this prestigious award, and I can tell you he absolutely deserves it. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have such a selfless, all-around good guy keeping the families in my district safe.

Thank you, Mike, for your commitment to the people you protect and to the entire community. We are grateful for your service.

EQUAL PAY DAY

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week, we recognize Equal Pay Day—a somber reminder of the intolerably wide wage gulf that still exists between men and women. This is not just a “woman’s issue.” It affects every working family throughout our economy from top to bottom.

The average woman in America today makes 79 cents for every dollar a man makes—even less for women of color. That disparity, when spread across the course of a woman’s working life, can deprive her and her family of over \$430,000, which is nearly \$11,000 annually. Nobody can afford such dispossession, especially families who are already struggling to survive.

The gender pay gap will not fix itself without there being immediate congressional action. We already have a bill that is designed to right this wrong—the Paycheck Fairness Act—which is cosponsored by every single House Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to enact it so that all American women can at least know they are worth equal pay for equal work.

□ 1630

BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON and Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE for their leadership on continuing to ensure that we don’t forget about the 276 young women who were stolen from their families 2 years ago.

I traveled to Nigeria with Congresswoman WILSON and Congresswoman JACKSON LEE right after the kidnapping in order to see what kind of efforts were being made to get them back.

This kidnapping received international attention for a short time and then, like the girls, it disappeared. We are standing here exactly 2 years later

while the Chibok girls, who we call “our girls,” remain hidden and subject to unimaginable crimes.

Boko Haram, the deadliest terrorist organization in the world, wants to silence these girls. I stand here with my colleagues to give “our girls” a stronger voice than the terrorists and more power than fear.

I want the Chibok girls to know that they are our daughters and we will not give up until they are returned.

KEEP THE PENSION PROMISES ACT AND PENSION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for 1 minute on the Central States Pension Fund, which right now, because of its demise, is going to gut the pensions of thousands and thousands of workers in Ohio, over 4,000 in my district alone.

I want to thank MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio for spearheading this legislation in which we ask the wealthiest people in the country, those who are trading art, to help us raise the \$29 billion we need to put back into this pension fund.

We have senior citizens who have spent 30 or 40 years as Teamsters or Machinists, working their rear ends off, earning a pension, saying: We don’t want the money now—as they negotiated contracts—you take this wage that we could have and you save it for later, but we want it back.

This bill, these pieces of legislation, help to restore some respect and dignity for those workers in Ohio and across the country.

I ask my colleagues to help us with the Keep the Pension Promises Act and the Pension Accountability Act. People need to be respected, and these pensions need to be secured.

THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized by you to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I come to the floor here today with an issue that I think is important that America have a dialogue on the topic, and some of that is going on. It is going on in the Presidential races across the country and in the coffee shops and at work, at play, at church, and around the country in the things that we do.

But when a moment in history comes along that shocked a lot of us to the core—and that was the abrupt and unexpected loss of Justice Antonin

Scalia, a person whom I got to know. I would like to say that I called him a friend. He was a person whose personality I enjoyed a lot, his robust sense of humor, his acerbic wit in the way that he conveyed his messages, especially when he wrote the dissenting opinions for the Supreme Court. He found himself occasionally in the minority, but I think he was almost always right in those constitutional decisions.

When Justice Scalia wrote those minority opinions, he realized that—and he just thought in advance—that the students in law school would have to read the dissenting opinions as well as the majority opinions.

So he made sure when he wrote especially his dissenting opinions that they were engaging, they were entertaining, they were provocative, and they were challenging. It caused the law school students to read those and remember the points that Justice Scalia had made.

That is a legacy of the 30 years of Justice Scalia that will live within the annals of the history of the United States of America, especially those who are studying constitutional law and those that are in law school.

The constitutional law students around America too seldom are taught constitutional law out of the Constitution itself. We have a President of the United States who spent 10 years as an adjunct professor teaching constitutional law at the University of Chicago.

I have met with a good number of the students that he taught. The ones that I met with, at least, said that, whenever they laid out a conservative principle and made a constitutional argument based upon those conservative principles, that then-adjunct professor Barack Obama would always turn that around to the activist side, to move the needle hard to the left.

It is my position—and I believe it is also the position of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the House and especially the chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Senate—that the Constitution must be read and interpreted to mean what it says. It would mean precisely the text of the Constitution as it was understood to mean at the time of ratification.

The Constitution itself, Mr. Speaker, is the equivalent of—and I would say literally is—an intergenerational contractual guarantee from one generation of Americans to the next, to the next, to the next.

Our Founding Fathers understood that, and they so carefully crafted this Constitution. The language in it reflects their convictions and their guarantee to each generation.

If it were to be anything else, if it were to be a living and breathing document, as too many of our Justices on the Supreme Court and far too many on our Federal bench today, that 40 percent or so that will have been appointed by Barack Obama by the end of his term—those Justices, by and large,

don't believe what I've just said, Mr. Speaker.

They generally believe that the text of the Constitution is something that they can massage, that they can manipulate, that they can interpret and reinterpret to mean that which they would want it to mean if it were written by them today.

Of course, the words wouldn't be the same, but the ideology that grows from many of these precedent decisions shows that and is proof of it.

If anyone wonders, Mr. Speaker, I would take them back to the Court last June 24 and 25. On one day, the Supreme Court concluded that they could rewrite law. On the next day, the Supreme Court concluded that they could create not just new rights in the Constitution, but create a command in the Constitution.

Now, I hope to return to that topic in a little bit, Mr. Speaker.

What we have in front of us is this: The loss of Justice Scalia leaves an empty seat on the Supreme Court. It is an intellectual hole, not just a voting hole. But it is an intellectual hole left by the towering legal intellect of Justice Scalia.

In times throughout history—there are conflicting reports—one can make the political argument and one can make the traditional argument as to whether a President should be able to make an appointment to the Supreme Court and have that appointment ratified and confirmed by the United States Senate.

Under these circumstances that we have today—this is an election year, and the loss of Justice Scalia and the creation of that empty seat on the Supreme Court has brought about a nomination for the Supreme Court that has been produced by President Barack Obama, even though the majority party in the Senate, concurring with Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL from Kentucky, as well as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY, have said: We are not going to take up a nominee and we are not going to have hearings in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

That means that we won't have a debate on the floor of the Senate for confirmation because they believe—and it is their prerogative to do so—they believe that the next Justice on the Supreme Court should be a reflection of the voice of the people who will go to the polls this coming November and an elected President of the United States who more accurately reflects the will of the people rather than a President who is a lameduck President.

I agree with Senator GRASSLEY and I agree with Majority Leader Senator MCCONNELL that this is a decision that is too big to be made by people who are on the way out the door. The President is on the way out the door. There are Members of the Senate that are on their way out the door.

We need the fresh faces that have the freshest support of the American peo-

ple making these decisions, particularly the next President of the United States.

Now, predictably, when an argument like this comes up, each side seeks to gain a political advantage. Yes, this is a political decision. It is a political decision that needs to be based on the foundation, however, of the Constitution and the text of the Constitution and the understanding of the Constitution to mean what it says and mean what it was interpreted to mean at the time that it was ratified.

Our Founding Fathers gave us a means to amend the Constitution. So they didn't intend our Constitution to be a living, breathing document, as the people on the left say.

They intended it to be fixed in place, an intergenerational contractual guarantee, so that my grandchildren and great-grandchildren and each succeeding generation can count on this Constitution meaning what it says.

I have watched it distorted. I have watched it usurped by decisions made in our Federal courts and by our Supreme Court and a people and a public that will honor those decisions because they are made by the judges, not because they are constitutionally grounded decisions.

So this appointment that comes before the Supreme Court—first, I will go to this. In our Constitution, Mr. Speaker, Article II, section 2—the authority of the executive branch of government must be here somewhere.

Article II, section 2: This is the text we are working with, Mr. Speaker. This is the language that governs the nomination, the advice, the consent, and the appointment to the Supreme Court in this fashion.

I will read this verbatim from Article II, section 2:

“He”—meaning the President of the United States—this is executive branch authority—“He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to . . . nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint . . . judges of the Supreme Court . . .”

Now, he shall have power to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent, appoint judges of the Supreme Court. That is power to nominate and appoint by and with the consent, Mr. Speaker.

So the language here is clear, “by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.” The advice and consent of the Senate is determined by the Senate. The consent of the Senate is the confirmation vote.

The advice would be that the President is to go to the Senate and say: I have got an appointment here to the Supreme Court. You all know that. Do you have some names you would like to offer? What is your counsel here? Look at the makeup of the Court. What is missing? Who do we have on the bench today? How are they contributing? What kind of job are they doing in ruling upon the supreme law of the

land, the Constitution itself, and the text of the statutes that Congress has passed that go before the Court for evaluation as to their constitutionality?

I will go further than to suggest, Mr. Speaker. I will assert that we have a Court today that too often reaches outside its bounds. And if I had a criticism of Justice Scalia, it would be his deeper respect for stare decisis that I happen to see in a Justice such as Clarence Thomas.

But when a decision is made by the Court, there has been essentially a consent of the Court to accept that decision, to build on it, rather than to go back and reevaluate afresh, anew from the text of the Constitution.

I think we need to go back and refresh anew and take a look at the text of the Constitution with each decision of the Supreme Court with less deference to stare decisis.

□ 1645

The activists on the Court, on the other hand, are the exact opposite. They want to build these leftward precedents along the way so that, in the end, the Constitution would be obliterated.

That is the direction that President Obama has gone. It is the direction he seeks to go. I would submit that I don't expect that he is going to be able to make an appointment to the Supreme Court that would reflect a Justice on the bench whose interpretation of the Constitution would be to the text and the original understanding and meaning of it, but, instead, activist judges. That is the history that he has produced.

I have not evaluated Judge Garland. I don't have a comment on his work except that this is not the time to confirm an appointment for Barack Obama and let him shape this Court for the next generation or so. If we get this wrong, Mr. Speaker, we lose our Constitution for the next generation.

No matter how astute our Presidents have been, no matter how deeply they have been committed to the Constitution itself, we have still seen that, even under Ronald Reagan, he got about half of his appointments to the Court right.

We need a President coming around the pike that gets every one of them right. I wouldn't be happy and satisfied until all nine of the Justices on the Court reflected that they are traditionalists, that they are textualists, that they are originalists in the Constitution, and that the judges that are coming up on the Federal bench would also meet that same standard.

I am not in the United States Senate. We don't have a vote on the confirmation of appointments to our Federal courts over here in the House. I do serve on the Committee on the Judiciary, and this is the end of the 14th year that I have done that, Mr. Speaker.

And so the voice of time and observation and reading and consideration and

experience, especially as a member of the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice of the House Committee on the Judiciary, yes, I have deep convictions on this issue and considerable experience and knowledge base on it.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this House of Representatives evaluate the arguments that I am making here and the arguments that Senator GRASSLEY is making on the other side of the rotunda, and these arguments say we take an oath. This will be my argument.

Mr. Speaker, we all take an oath here to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. So do the Justices of the Supreme Court take that oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. The President of the United States takes an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. These are serious oaths.

When you stand up before God and country and say “so help me God,” you better mean it. That means that the Constitution isn’t a malleable document. When you take an oath to support and defend it, that doesn’t mean you can take an oath to support and defend the Constitution as, let’s say, amended by a Supreme Court.

I would support and defend a Constitution amended constitutionally only. The Supreme Court Justices are the last people on the planet that ought to be engaged in amending the Constitution of the United States.

But if I could take you back to those dates I mentioned—June 24, June 25, 2015—June 24, if you want to look at the calendar, is going to be a Thursday. That was the date that the decision came out on *ObamaCare*. That was *King v. Burwell*.

That decision, Mr. Speaker, a majority opinion written by the Chief Justice, boiled down to this: Congress passed a law in two different components. I call it *ObamaCare*. They called it the Affordable Care Act.

I have said that George Washington could not utter those words in referencing that legislation because it is not affordable and George Washington could not tell a lie. But it was actually the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

That long lingo threw people off. So they boiled it down to the Affordable Care Act. We boiled it down to *ObamaCare*. *ObamaCare* is far more descriptive than the Affordable Care Act and far more honest.

But that legislation came in two packages. It was passed by hook, by crook, by legislative shenanigan, and that wasn’t just me saying that. There was at least one Democrat here on the floor who used the term “legislative shenanigan” in reference to the passage of *ObamaCare*.

It was passed in that fashion. Yet, when it began to be implemented, they wrote thousands of pages of regulations that could not have been imagined at

the time that that bill passed the floor here.

There was a massive amount of arm twisting and leverage like this country has never seen. We had tens of thousands of people that surrounded this Capitol and pleaded: Keep your hands off of our health insurance. Keep your hands off of our health care. They wanted their freedom.

The people who came here understood this, that the most sovereign thing that we have is our own soul. And the Federal Government hasn’t figured out how to tax it, how to nationalize it, how to take it away from us.

We are in control of our eternal salvation—that is our soul—and we manage that. Each one of us manages it. But the second most sovereign thing we have is our health, our skin, and everything inside it.

Yet, this Congress, House and Senate, together with the President of the United States—on March 23, 2010, he signed into law the combination of the two bills that became *ObamaCare* that I said were passed by hook, crook, and legislative shenanigan and have their own constitutional problems.

I would argue the Supreme Court at least twice has ruled outside the Constitution in order to get *ObamaCare* implemented, and one of those was the State exchanges.

The statutory authority for the States to establish insurance exchanges under the auspices of the State exists within *ObamaCare*, but the language that empowers the States to do so does not include the Federal Government. The Federal Government did not have the constitutional authority to establish exchanges, and it needed the language.

If the Obama administration had been astute, they may well have written into *ObamaCare* legislation three words, “or Federal Government,” so that the States or Federal Government would have the legal authority to establish the exchanges.

The Federal Government went ahead and established exchanges within the multiple States that refused to do so, and the Supreme Court’s job is to read the text of the language and rule on the text of the language and the law.

But, yet, in a 5-4 decision of the Supreme Court written by the Chief Justice, they decided that, if the Congress really might have at that time passed legislation with the language in it that would have said “or Federal Government,” that they would just go ahead and interpret that it really means: Well, okay. It was an oversight on the part of Congress.

They might have slipped that in there if they had just known that they needed to write it in there. But it was maybe an oversight by staff in the middle of the night because, after all, the then-Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, said we have to pass this legislation in order to find out what is in it.

Well, she didn’t say we had to pass it to find out what wasn’t in it. But what

wasn’t in it was the authority for the Federal Government to go into the States and intervene and establish their own exchanges within the States. But this Obama administration did that with the people’s tax dollars, and I will say in violation of the law.

When it was appealed to the Supreme Court to assert just that, the Supreme Court ruled, well, it would have been better for the policy, in their judgment, if the language had been in there, “or Federal Government.”

But it wasn’t in there. So they deemed it in. That is a legislative decision made by a 5-4 decision of the Supreme Court that came down on us June 24, 2015. That is appalling to me.

I am aghast at the idea that a Supreme Court could be ruling upon the supreme law of the land and come down with a decision that they are now the legislative body to completely alter legislation that was the due decision of, I think, an erroneous decision, but a majority decision of the United States Congress.

Now, in any other world, in any other time, in any other kind of a decision that would come down, a Supreme Court could, should, has, and would justly send it back to Congress with this directive: We can’t find in here the language you may have wanted to pass. If you want this language in this bill, Article I says all legislative authority is vested in the Congress of the United States.

So the only right choice for a Supreme Court faced with this kind of a decision was to not remand it back to a lower court for a decision, essentially and, I will say, virtually, remand it to Congress and say to Congress: If you want to have federally established exchanges within the States, you have to pass a law that says so.

That is not what they did. They decided that they could change the law over at the Supreme Court building.

Now, if that can be done, if the Supreme Court of the United States can take on the trappings of a legislature and become a super legislature—and, by the way, they are appointed for life, for life.

So there is no consequence for people who can’t be voted out of office. You can’t even replace them for the duration of their life.

But they made the decision that they were the super legislature, and 5-4, under *King v. Burwell*, they put three words de facto, three words into the *ObamaCare* legislation, “or Federal Government.”

Now, I am barely up off the floor from reading this on that Thursday, June 24, 2015, and, as the Sun comes up on me on the following morning, I am contemplating: What do we do about this? How does Congress react? What should the public messages be in one part?

At 9:00 in the morning in Iowa, 10:00 D.C. time, I am rolling into St. Anne’s Catholic Church in Logan, Iowa, to do an event there with a visiting priest

and with the parish there at St. Anne's in Logan, Iowa.

And who merged together—at the same time we pulled in and parked essentially simultaneously—was the vehicle of former Senator Rick Santorum, one of the leading constitutionalists in this country, one of the strongest people in defense of life and defense of marriage and defense of the Constitution that we have seen—and I will say within a generation—with deep convictions, a clear understanding, and a very articulate voice.

As we got out of our vehicles, each of us had been listening to the news report of the decision that came down from the Supreme Court that day. That was a decision on marriage. I pronounce it Obergefell decision.

But that decision on marriage that came down on Friday, June 25, 2015, where the Supreme Court—I mentioned in the earliest part of my conversation, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court would legislate from the bench, and the Supreme Court not only created what would be a new right from the bench, but they created—they manufactured out of thin air a command, a command to every State in the Union.

That command that they created without any constitutional basis whatsoever was to the States this: If you are to have civil marriage in your State, it shall include same-sex marriage on equal standing with a man and a woman joined together in matrimony. No matter what your State laws, no matter what your State constitutions say, we usurp it from the Supreme Court with an edict, a directive, a command, that you shall conduct same-sex marriages on equal standing and you shall recognize same-sex marriages from other States with reciprocity as well.

Now, this is not a decision that could have been made by the United States Congress and not had it challenged. And I would say the Congress does not have the authority to impose same-sex marriage on the rest of the country.

If we had had the audacity to make such a decision in the House and the Senate and signed by the President, somebody would take that to the Supreme Court and say: Show me the enumerated power that Congress has to regulate marriage in such a fashion.

I would argue that we don't have that constitutional authority, but I would submit that the States do have. The States under the Ninth and Tenth Amendment do have the authority.

If they decide to establish same-sex marriage in their State legislatures and they can get their Governor to sign the legislation or override a veto, any one or any combination of or all of the States could pass a same-sex marriage law, I would respect that as a constitutional decision made by we, the people, whether it is we, the people of Iowa, or we, the people of another State, or all other States, for that matter, but not the Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker.

The Supreme Court of the United States didn't just manufacture a right,

they created a command to the States, and that is constitutionally offensive to me to read a decision like that.

By the way, I had a preview of it because the State Supreme Court in Iowa did just that in about 2009 and some of us dug down into that decision. That was about a 63- or 64-page decision, and it was an appalling, sloppy piece of legal work that was written with, I believe, a conclusion. And then they had to go through a lot of legalistic and mental and logical contortions to get to their conclusion.

I would invite anybody to read that decision. I believe that an objective reading of that decision brings them down with the same characterization that I would have.

I want judges who read the Constitution and literally interpret the Constitution. And the judges who understand, as Justice Scalia did, that when he makes a decision based on the Constitution and the letter of the law—if he is uncomfortable with the policy decision that emerges with that, that tells him that he can be very comfortable with the constitutionality of the decision that he has made because, on policy, he disagrees, but he knows that he is not there to determine policy.

He is there, as Justice Roberts said in his confirmation accurately, I think, to call the balls and the strikes, not to be the one that is a player in that arena.

□ 1700

So we have Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, the man who is standing in the gap and a man who is the chairman of the United States Senate Judiciary Committee who has the control over the agenda of that committee and decides whether there will be hearings before the Judiciary Committee on this appointment of the President or whether there will not be—and he has said in conjunction with Majority Leader MCCONNELL, that there will not be hearings in the Judiciary Committee. And CHUCK GRASSLEY is right, MITCH MCCONNELL is right.

This argument gets cast back and forth—and it will be cast back and forth—and the amperage of this will go up and up and up between now and the election. They will turn that into a political football.

For me, I say: Take CHUCK GRASSLEY's word to the bank and we are done talking about it. But they want the political leverage. So they will be pressuring CHUCK GRASSLEY.

Mr. Speaker, here is a little bit of what is going on. Here is my public position on the issue. And it had to do with a press conference where I said, "There is no reason to have that hearing. The simple answer to it is this: It's inconceivable that he"—President Obama—"would nominate someone to the Supreme Court who believes in the Constitution. If we're going to save our Constitution, we can't have an Obama nominee on the court."

Mr. Speaker, that is maybe a blunt statement, but I have watched the history and the pattern of Barack Obama and appointments that he has made to the court. There is no question that they are liberal, leftist activists who want to come down with decisions that are more in the direction of the leadership of the ideology on the left and with very little deference to the Founding Fathers and anchored to the text of the Constitution.

And I have given what the Constitution says about nominations by advice and consent. Again, the President "shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint." In other words, the President can't make an appointment to the Supreme Court unless he has the advice and consent of the Senate.

Now, advice could be fairly loosely interpreted, but consent is a different story. That takes a vote to do that—judges to the Supreme Court. That means the President nominates, the Senate can provide the advice before the nomination—that would be the best—and perhaps some advice after. But the consent of the Senate is required or there won't be a seat in the Supreme Court that is filled by Barack Obama.

Now, I point out also that there is nothing in this Constitution that says that there has to be nine Justices on the Supreme Court. This is where the House could actually weigh in on this, if we decide to do this. The Constitution of the United States requires that the Congress establish a Supreme Court. And then it is up to our discretion as to what other Federal court we might want to establish.

Mr. Speaker, I actually had this debate with Justice Scalia. One of the things I enjoyed about him was little banter along the way and how these arguments came out. And I made the point to him that the Constitution only requires that the Congress establish a Supreme Court, not all the other Federal courts. So we could—Congress—abolish all of the Federal districts that are there. We could say there will be no Federal courts. It will all be handled through the Supreme Court itself. That is not a practical application, but it is from a constitutional perspective.

Then I said to Justice Scalia that we could eliminate all the Federal courts except the Supreme Court. And over time, we could reduce the Supreme Court. There is no requirement that the Supreme Court have nine Justices or seven or five or three. We could reduce the Supreme Court of the United States down to the Chief Justice. There is no requirement that we build or fund a building or heat it or wire it for electronics or anything. There is no requirement that we have staff for any of the Supreme Court. The Congress could crank all the Federal courts down to just the Supreme Court, reduce the Supreme Court down to just the Chief Justice at his own card table, with candle, no staff, and no facility.

That is the argument I made to Justice Scalia. Some of this I do for entertainment value because he always was an engaging fellow to have these conversations with.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you ever heard this point made to him before, but Justice Scalia's response to it was: I would argue that there is a requirement that there be three Justices on the Supreme Court; otherwise, there is no reason to have a Chief Justice.

I thought that was a pretty astute response, Mr. Speaker. But my response to that was: we have always had too many chiefs and not enough Indians.

So we had a little fun with that and moved on, but that is the leverage that the House and the Senate has together. There is not a requirement that there be a ninth Justice on the Supreme Court. I am comfortable with that and supportive of that, but I want to fill that seat with someone that reflects the values of Justice Scalia and perhaps one that will reflect even more closely the values of Justice Thomas, in particular.

And there are a number of other Justices that I admire on the Supreme Court, but another activist on the Supreme Court is not what this country needs. This country needs to have a constitutionalist, an originalist, a textualist on the Supreme Court that will reflect the meaning of this Constitution at its time of ratification.

And that is why our Founders gave us a means to amend the Constitution. They didn't intend for the Supreme Court to be taking on the trappings of a super legislature and legislating on one day by adding words to ObamaCare, and then the very next day create the new command in the Constitution that the State shall conduct same-sex marriages and honor same-sex marriages in other States. That is over the top. That is beyond the pale.

If you can imagine what our Founding Fathers would say, how about the signers of the Declaration of Independence?

If we could bring them to life today and walk them out here into Statuary Hall and say: take a look at this painting up here where you are all signing this Declaration of Independence. Or better yet, go over to the Archives, where they pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor, and you can still see John Hancock's signature there almost as clearly as the day that he may well have signed that.

What would those Founding Fathers say if they knew that within a 24-hour window or maybe a 25-hour window, the Supreme Court of the United States said, We are going to confer national health insurance on everybody in America, and the Congress didn't write the law right, so we wrote it for them; and then the next day, same-sex marriage?

You wouldn't find a single Founding Father that would agree with either one of those decisions, Mr. Speaker. We are on the cusp of making an appoint-

ment to the Supreme Court that would feed this back to us and do more and more and more.

How do you possibly teach the Constitution to young people? How do you teach civics to young people if the Constitution itself is moving in such a way that no one can predict what would happen?

I am very pleased to see that I am joined by another constitutionalist out of the State of Florida, who is a clear thinker and has a good understanding. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO), my friend and a doctor.

Mr. YOHIO. I would like to thank my colleague for those kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a quick moment to add to the important work that Mr. KING is doing and to thank my colleague for yielding me the time and for his continued leadership in the fight to ensure the dignity of the Supreme Court so that it is not undermined by the nomination and subsequent appointment of a Justice whose judicial ideologies run counter to the Founders' constitutional principles, as you have spoken so eloquently about.

The United States of America, the great American experiment, is an experiment that has surpassed centuries of speculation and persisted through the Civil War, an experiment that survived two World Wars and continues to stand as a beacon of hope to nations across the globe, an experiment made possible because of the foresight of our Founding Fathers—and it had to have some divine intervention because men just aren't that smart, so there was wisdom—who recognized the necessity to establish a government ruled by a series of laws they felt were so essential to ensure equal opportunity—not equal outcome, but equal opportunity—in the pursuit of prosperity and happiness to all citizens.

These documents—the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights—I have right here. I want people to look at this. This is the entire Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. I think if you look at it, we will all agree it is not an epic in volume. Even my colleague across the aisle recognizes that.

It is not an epic in volume, but yet it is an epic in the ideology of what America stands for. And it stands for opportunity. And if you put work behind that, it becomes the American Dream, your American Dream. The very fabric of this country is our core value, our founding principles, and the Constitution that preserves this.

And that is the very document that gives people on the left the voice of dissonance, as it does people on the right. And if we lose this—these principles—we lose that very argument, the very thing that made America great.

And I ask you: Are those ideologies Republican or Democrat, conservative, liberal, White, Black, or any other adjective you want to throw in there?

And I would venture to say that you would all say no, they are American

ideologies. That is why this discussion is so important.

The United States is facing an unprecedented attack by activist justices in both the lower and upper courts. If leaders were to yield to the demands of President Obama or any other executive in the future, and nominate any individual who does not have a true, tried, and tested conservative record on constitutional issues, the ensuing Supreme Court opinions could be detrimental to constitutional law for years, if not decades, to come. And I would surmise that if we cross that bridge and go beyond the constitutional principles of this country, what America is, what it has been in the past, and what we hope it to be in the future may be lost in the history of time.

While I fully understand the importance of having a full Bench and all nine Justices available to hear some of the most critical cases of our time, it should not be done at the expense of our Constitution. That is a document we all should revere. We all should stand up and protect it. After all, don't we all give an oath to uphold that sacred document?

As American culture has ebbed and flowed—and it will continue to—morphing into what it is today, it was these founding documents that fostered an environment where the voice of the few, not just the many, could be heard.

And that is the beauty of our country: a constitutional Republic. So many people want to refer to it as a democracy. A democracy is majority rule. A democracy is mob rule. And as Ben Franklin was often quoted:

Democracy is the same as two wolves and a sheep deciding what to have for lunch.

As we know, in that story, the sheep always loses. So that is why it is so important, because a constitutional Republic protects the rights of the minority, of all people.

American culture, as I said, has ebbed and flowed over the period of time and it is morphing and will continue to morph. They have allowed for the people to dictate change, not a man who likes to remind the American people that he believes he can rewrite our history and, through the use of his phone and a pen, direct executive agencies to act with disregard to the voice of the people. A pen and a phone are not a replacement for the legislative body. And it is the Senate's chore to pick that person.

Take, for example, a vital case about to be argued before the Supreme Court next week: *United States v. Texas*. To some, this may seem like a simple anti-immigration or, in some cases, a pro-immigration case. But at its core, it is not about whether or not you are anti- or pro-immigration. It is about whether or not the Supreme Court will allow the executive branch to circumvent Congress and legislate from the Oval Office rather than through Capitol Hill, the way it was intended by our Founders.

I believe the Constitution is clear on this issue, but I also believe any Justice who does not have a deep appreciation for the Constitution, as the late Justice Scalia did, would disagree with me. Therein lies the danger: any Justice who is willing to tip the scale in the balance of power in favor of a runaway Presidential office.

And it is not just this administration. It could be any in the future. And that is why this is so important. This crosses party lines. It is a political ideology that I would argue threatens the very fabric of the foundation and the founding of our Nation.

Congress cannot allow itself to cave and settle for a Justice that would be complacent in the destruction of the Constitution and ultimately the destruction of the great American experiment.

□ 1715

I challenge the President to get serious with this nomination and put forth the name of a Justice that will uphold the constitutional principles and not legislate from the bench.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to hold steadfast and not allow themselves to be persuaded by public opinion, public pressure, and by those who will try to pressure them to vote for any nominee who will do the American legacy and the American people an injustice by undermining the Constitution from the highest court in this great Nation.

This discussion is so important. The very fabric of this discussion and the very basis of this discussion is about the preservation of this institution. That is what this is about.

If you look at a timeline of human history and you look at the American experiment, it is but a dot on that period of time, but it has created the greatest country in the world. The reason that has been allowed is because of the Constitution.

Again, those ideologies aren't Republican; they are not Democrat. They are American ideologies so that we will all benefit. And we all have a hand to preserve those. We can have our differences, but this is one thing we shouldn't differ on, and this is for the posterity of all Americans: conservatives, liberals, White, Black, anybody else.

This is something we stand strong on, and I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa, my colleague and mentor, Mr. KING, for bringing this up. I thank you for continuing the fight and bringing this out to the American people. This is important.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time and thanking very much the gentleman from Florida for the compliments and the input here, too.

I learned something in this discussion and listening to Mr. YOHIO from Florida, and that is, when he spoke of divine intervention in our Constitution, the answer required divine intervention because men just aren't that smart.

I hadn't heard that expression in this town or anyplace. That explains it in a lot of ways. I have long said that I believe that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are written with divine guidance.

I choose those terms because the Bible was written with divine intervention and divine inspiration. That is up here. Divine guidance is just a little click below that. I don't want to claim Biblical standards, but it is really close. We would not have this country if it were not for God's guidance of our Founding Fathers, and so I tuned my ear to that.

I would say also, whose advice should the Senators listen to on the other side?

Well, they should listen to TED YOHIO's advice. I hope they are listening to my advice, Mr. Speaker. But those on the Republican side of the aisle, they are pretty solid.

I want to publicly and personally thank my friend, whom I appreciate and respect a lot, JERRY MORAN, who has been in a difficult place in Kansas. He is a terrific friend, and I served with him here in the House of Representatives. His position is shored up in opposition to having hearings in the Judiciary Committee and trying to move this. I think the reconsideration that he has done is a good thing, and I hope the people of Kansas understand and appreciate JERRY MORAN in the fashion that I do as well.

I would suggest that maybe JERRY MORAN and some of the Democrat Senators, in particular, may have been listening to this advice, Mr. Speaker. This would be advice from the Vice President himself, JOE BIDEN, advice that he gave on June 25, 1992. So it has sustained the test of time in this fashion. It is called the Biden Rule. Quote, from Vice President JOE BIDEN:

It is my view that if a Supreme Court Justice resigns tomorrow, or within the next several weeks, or resigns at the end of the summer, President Bush should consider following the practice of a majority of his predecessors and not—repeats it—and not name a nominee until after the November election is completed.

That is JOE BIDEN, and, at that time, he was the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Mr. Speaker. Again, that was June 25, 1992. We are only a couple of months away in proportion to that in this period of time.

So if our friends over on the Senate side are not listening to the Vice President, I would suggest they might listen to the Senate minority leader, HARRY REID, the former majority leader in the Senate.

This is HARRY REID's statement made in 2005. You will note that this was back when George W. Bush was President. HARRY REID, minority leader today in the Senate:

The duties of the United States Senate are set forth in the Constitution of the United States. Nowhere in that document does it say that the Senate has a duty to give Presidential nominees a vote. It says appointments shall be made with the advice and

consent of the Senate. That is very different than saying every nominee receives a vote . . . The Senate is not a rubber stamp for the executive branch.

That is HARRY REID, 2005.

Both of those gentlemen, I would say today, would argue against their previous arguments. I am reinforcing their arguments today on the floor of the House of Representatives.

We are not finished, Mr. Speaker. Who is another strong, influential voice over there in the Senate Judiciary Committee?

Senator SCHUMER of New York. He wanted to block the Bush nominees, and here is what he had to say. He said:

We should not confirm any Bush nominee to the Supreme Court except in extraordinary circumstances.

Senator SCHUMER cited ideological reasons for the delay, and I begin another quote:

They must prove by actions, not words, that they are in the mainstream, rather than we have to prove that they are not.

Well, there is a statement of ambiguity for you, Mr. Speaker, requiring an appointment to the Supreme Court to prove that they are in the mainstream.

What is the mainstream? That would be what CHUCK SCHUMER would define as the mainstream, depending upon whether or not he supported the candidate that was speaking to present themselves to be in the mainstream.

I would argue that mainstream is not a requirement for an appointment to the Supreme Court. The requirements for the appointment to the Supreme Court are determined by the discretion and the judgment of the confirming Senators over on the other side of this Capitol Building, and they should be obligated to only confirm Justices who interpret the Constitution to mean what it says.

To mean what it says. Is that too much to ask? Why, then, do we have a Constitution if it can't mean what it says?

Senator SCHUMER wasn't done, however. He argued again in 2007:

We should reverse the presumption of confirmation. The Supreme Court is dangerously out of balance. We cannot afford to see Justice Stevens replaced by another Roberts, or a Justice Ginsburg by another Alito.

That was 2007.

Well, I think the Supreme Court is dangerously out of balance precisely because of the Justices that Senator SCHUMER supports and because there are not enough Justices on the Supreme Court that he has opposed, because I believe that the Justices need to reflect and protect the text and the original understanding of the Constitution.

Every Founding Father believed that as well when they went to their grave; and they would be rolling over in it if they saw a Supreme Court that was writing law on one day, manufacturing commands the next day, and now hearing an argument that the President of the United States has a right to his appointment to the Supreme Court, no

matter what kind of activist he might serve up, that is going to visit upon the American people, for at least the next generation, decisions that usurp the authority of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate and commandeer the legislative authority away from Article I and commandeer some kind of authority to manufacture commands, as they did last June.

Then, we are not done yet. In case this argument isn't strong enough at this point, Mr. Speaker, here is another.

The very individual that made the appointment to the Supreme Court, that would be then-Senator Barack Obama, now President Obama, he filibustered the Alito appointment—the Alito nomination. Excuse me.

Here is what then-Senator Obama argued in 2006. Well, they say this now. This is his spokesman today: "President Obama regrets filibustering the nomination of Supreme Court Justice Samuel Alito in 2006"—this is from his top spokesman who said, just a week or so ago, "though he maintains that the Republican opposition to his effort to replace Justice Antonin Scalia is unprecedented."

No, the President of the United States' opposition to Justice Alito was unprecedented, not the opposition created here by Chairman GRASSLEY or Majority Leader MCCONNELL and almost every Republican over there in the United States Senate; and I don't know any Republicans in the House who think they ought to move this appointment now.

So, here are some other positions along the way, Mr. Speaker, regarding Senator GRASSLEY's comments. Senator GRASSLEY made some strong positions on the floor of the Senate a little over a week ago, and they were published in *Politico*, as I recall, where it would be this. The Supreme Court has weighed in on this nomination, and that would be Chief Justice Roberts has intervened and made comments in this way: that before Scalia had passed away, he argued that the confirmation process is not functioning very well, that it has gotten too political.

I was very proud of Senator GRASSLEY when he stepped up on the floor of the Senate and rebutted that argument and he made the case that, no, the confirmation process in the United States Senate has gotten political precisely because the Court itself is making political decisions rather than decisions based upon the law and the supreme law of the land, the Constitution.

So when you see political decisions come out of the Court—and those decisions, I have described some of them; there are many others—that means that the confirmation process itself is political.

And when I sat before the Supreme Court and heard the oral arguments before the Court—and I hope to do that again next week—I was amazed. I expected that I would hear profound con-

stitutional arguments before the United States Supreme Court. I mean, I grew up, I guess, naively believing that those were the arguments made before that Court. I think the Warren Court had already turned that thing in the other direction, and I didn't realize it.

But when I first sat before the United States Supreme Court and listened for those arguments, thinking it was going to be an amazing educational experience for me, what I found was there weren't any profound constitutional arguments made. Those arguments, instead, were being made to the swing Justice on the Court to try to get to that individual's heart, because they understood the various proclivities in the thinking and the rationale that might come. They went back and looked at the lives, the lifestyle, the history of the Justices and wondered what moves their heart rather than what moves their rationale. We should only have Justices whose rationale is moved by constitutional arguments before the Court.

Let's see. Who else do I have?

President Obama, who made the argument that he wants appointments to the Supreme Court who have—what is the word?—compassion, empathy. President Obama's word is "empathy."

We are not looking for empathy on the Supreme Court. We are looking for Justices that can rule on the letter and the text and the original meaning and understanding of the Constitution, and the letter and text of the law here in Congress that we passed.

And, yes, they can take into consideration congressional intent, but they can't amend the language. If the language says one thing, they don't get to add words to it. They should ship it back over here and tell us what they have interpreted that it said, and then the Congress can decide whether or not we want to act.

We take an oath to support and defend the Constitution. That doesn't mean we are bound by a decision of the Supreme Court that turns the Constitution on its head.

So this fight that is going on in the Supreme Court with the nomination to the Court now is one that will turn the destiny of the United States of America.

Depending on who ends up as the next President of the United States, I have every confidence that Senator GRASSLEY holds his ground, that there will not be hearings before the United States Senate Judiciary Committee, that the Senate prerogative will prevail, and that the people will go to the polls in November and elect a President. Part of that decision will be: Will that President make the right appointment to the Supreme Court?

In the meantime, CHUCK GRASSLEY, the man who is now the chairman of the committee, stands in the gap in the same way that Leonidas stood against Xerxes at the Battle of Thermopylae when he led the 300 to stand in that gap

and face 300,000 Persians. He is holding his ground. He is holding his ground nobly. He is holding it with conviction. He is holding it with determination. And we need to stand with him, beside him, and behind him in every way that we can and understand that this is a political assault that is going at him.

We should reward him for his convictions by electing a President who will make that appointment to the Supreme Court who reflects the will of the people. And the will of the people, I trust, will still want to see an appointment to the Supreme Court of a Justice who would stand up and say this Constitution means what it says.

The text of this Constitution has to mean what it says, and it has to be interpreted to mean that which it was understood to mean at the time of its ratification. And if you don't like what it does for our policy, then get to work and amend the Constitution. That is why that provision is there. That is why we have the amendments to the Constitution today.

So I thank Senator GRASSLEY for his strong stand. I thank MITCH MCCONNELL for his leadership in the Senate. I thank everyone over there who holds their ground, and everyone here in this Congress who takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution and means it.

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

□ 1730

FORCED ARBITRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials related to the subject of this Special Order, which is forced arbitration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it has been very thought-provoking to listen to the comments and observations of my good friend, STEVE KING from Iowa, and my other good friend, Representative TED YOHO from Florida.

It is always good to hear the impressions of laypersons about the law. I say that not in a condescending way because I know that my good friend, STEVE KING, is a successful businessman, construction, and he knows all about the business, and my friend, TED YOHO, is an esteemed doctor of veterinary medicine.

So being a lawyer myself by training, it is good for me to hear the impressions and observations of laypersons. I

say that in a noncondescending way. So I thank the gentleman from Iowa, Representative KING, for holding it down for us for that last hour.

The preamble to the U.S. Constitution, which is the introductory statement setting forth the general principles of our American government, reads: "We the people of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, 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."

I want to just put a bookmark right where it says "establish Justice." It says that right after it says "in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice."

So justice was something that was foremost in the minds of the Framers of our Constitution who, I believe, just as STEVE KING said, were divinely inspired in their deliberations and their decisionmaking in terms of our Constitution.

They were focused on the delivery of justice. They realized that justice was key. With that ideal, they established in Article III a court system, the judicial power and the framework for the court system. The judiciary, of course, is a coequal branch of government.

The courts, since the inception of this country, have served as a check and a balance on the excesses of the other branches of government while at the same time dispensing justice to individuals who are found to have violated the law or who have been aggrieved by the misconduct of someone else and, so, they come to court seeking justice. So justice is the business of the court system, and the court system's business is to render justice.

Now what is that word, justice? What does it mean? It is the maintenance or administration of what is just by law, as by judicial or other proceedings, in a court. Justice is the judgment of persons or causes by a judicial process to administer justice in a community. That is what justice is all about, and that is what courts do.

People bring to the court of justice their causes of action so that they can receive justice in the courts. The courts are set up with a set of procedures, rules, as to how you proceed in court. And then there are substantive laws upon which the court looks to the precedent that has been set and decides cases brought to it in accordance with those precedents.

Sometimes it must make new precedent, it must make new law, and it is done in accordance with the constitutional principles that have been laid out by our Framers. So this legal system has worked well. This legal system of trial by jury has worked very well.

In addition to maintaining order through the criminal laws, the civil laws have enabled people to achieve justice when they have been wronged, including wronged by corporations.

Companies don't like being brought to the bar of justice to be held accountable for wrongdoing. We know that corporations are powerful entities. They have more money than the average person. They are more powerful.

So the way to equalize the power of just an individual against a corporation that he or she has accused of wrongdoing—the equalizing factor has always been the jury system, a jury of one's peers.

That is what people have relied upon to address grievances, particularly with powers that are more powerful than they. They know that a jury of their peers is a mechanism whereby the truth can be found and that justice can be rendered.

So going to court and having a jury trial when a person is aggrieved is a part of the fundamental fabric of this Nation. That is how we have done business for so long.

It used to be before we had TV and radio that people would go down to the town square where the courthouse was always located and they would take the afternoon and they would go into the courtroom. They would have a calendar. They would know what cases were being heard.

It was a published calendar, and everybody knew that a certain lawyer would be in town to try a case. They would make their schedule such that they could go down and see that proceeding. It would be an open court. Nobody would be excluded. Everybody would know in advance what was going to happen.

You could sit there and watch the adversary process take place. You would see a judge seated, such as the Speaker is seated in this Chamber. That would be the person who would decide what laws were applicable. The jury would be to his or her left or right, and the judge would instruct them on the law.

After they have heard all of the evidence from the attorneys in that adversary process, the judge would instruct the jury on the law and charge the jury to find the facts in its own wisdom and apply justice.

The plaintiff would either win or lose, and the people would be in the courtroom watching the proceedings. And then, whatever happened everyone would have to live with.

Sometimes the plaintiff won. Sometimes the defense won. That is the way that it has always been in this country up until pretty recently.

Over the last 30 years or so, we have had an erosion of that process. The rich and powerful corporations have conspired to find ways that they can avoid being held accountable for the misdoings that they would be charged with committing by a regular person.

Let's face it, ladies and gentlemen. Corporations are just like people. People do wrong and, when they do wrong, you have to have some way of making them do right, of making it right. That is what the courts have always been for.

These corporations have gotten so powerful that they have come up with a way of privatizing the justice system. They have come up with a dispute resolution mechanism, which is not inherently bad, but it is being forced on people. That is the dispute resolution process known as arbitration.

Arbitration is a great alternative dispute resolution process when it is decided upon by the parties after a dispute has arisen.

But to bind a party to have to resolve a dispute in the arbitration setting as opposed to being able to exercise your Seventh Constitutional Amendment right to a jury trial and binding yourself, to have to go through an arbitration process, this is the scheme that has been hatched by the corporate interests who don't want to be held accountable in court.

So what they have done is inserted these forced arbitration clauses into agreements that they have with consumers.

So any kind of consumer agreement, for the most part nowadays, has a forced arbitration clause in it which requires that, in the event a dispute arises, the parties will settle that dispute not in a court of law, but in an arbitration proceeding.

Now, arbitration proceedings, unlike the courthouse, are done in private. There is no calendar that is published, and the people are not invited to come in. It is a secret proceeding.

It is a proceeding where, instead of having a judge trained in the law, you have got the possibility of having a layperson deciding the case. And that layperson may not be impartial.

That person may be making their living from getting referrals from the corporations to decide the arbitration cases that come before them. So it is an unfair process. It is a secret process.

The rules of procedure that are followed and required in a court are not required in an arbitration process nor are the substantive laws upon which cases are decided on precedent.

There is no requirement that the substantive law be used by the arbitrator in making the decision. Of course, there is no jury trial. There is no trial by a jury of one's peers.

So it is a very unfair setting, and it produces results that favor the corporations. This is what we are here to talk about today, this unfair, privatized secret system of justice that deprives people of having their day in court.

It is unaccountable. It is unaccountable to anyone other than to the corporate bosses that refer the cases to them. It is very unfair to the consumer, to the little guy.

So having said all of that, I yield to the gentleman from the State of Pennsylvania, MATT CARTWRIGHT, my friend, a distinguished trial attorney himself and, also, a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in this Congress, the ranking member of the Health Care, Benefits, and Administrative Rules Subcommittee and,

also, a member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

□ 1745

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me and for laying out the problem.

I rise proudly to remind my colleagues in this Chamber that what—as Representative TED YOHO of Florida just mentioned—what is in the Constitution really, really matters. In fact, I credit TED YOHO for carrying the Constitution with him at all times. I know that he says what is particularly dear to him in the Constitution is the Bill of Rights—those first 10 Amendments to the Constitution.

And Representative JOHNSON alluded to it earlier, it is the Seventh Amendment that we are talking about right now. If you are scoring at home, the Seventh Amendment is the thing that gives you the right to a jury trial in a civil case. And I'll quote it: "In suits at common law . . . the right of trial by jury shall be preserved . . ."

It is a short sentence, it is unambiguous, it is easy to understand, and it is something that makes us Americans—that we can go to court and have our disputes settled by a jury trial. It is one of the things that has made this Nation great. It is one of the things that we went to war over in the American War of Independence because the British king was trying to take that right away from us. In suits of common law, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved.

But I am here to say, Mr. Speaker, that there have been attacks on the Seventh Amendment. As Mr. JOHNSON pointed out so deftly, it is in the last 25 or 30 years that these attacks have come to a crescendo. Even in the Supreme Court of the United States now, they are getting so squishy on the Seventh Amendment that they think it is all right—it is a case called *Concepcion* from about 5 years ago—it is all right for corporations to have you enter into contracts that do away with your Seventh Amendment right to a jury trial in the event of a dispute. This is called a pre-dispute forced arbitration clause. It rears its ugly head in all sorts of ways to hurt workers and consumers and homeowners and Americans of every stripe.

Now, what is wrong with this?

What is wrong—and, again, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia alluded to this. The main problem is that it is a secret system of justice. It is not out in the open. He is right. America has a tradition of open court systems, trials that you can go watch, proceedings of justice that are open and transparent and open to the sunlight so that sneaky things don't happen, things that they would be embarrassed to tell you about don't happen. That is the purifying aspect of sunlight overall, and that is why we treasure our justice system here in the United States.

It is the opposite when you talk about forced arbitrations. You are

talking about arbitrators who have been selected by who knows who. Certainly not elected, certainly not appointed by elected officials. Accountable to no one. No one.

Is that really who you want deciding your case when you have a dispute?

Absolutely not.

Mr. Speaker, there is something even more insidious about these forced arbitration clauses, and that is this. It does away with any possibility of a class action.

Now, why do we care about that?

The ordinary American consumer may never get into a class action or know about one or care about one. But here is what happens.

If, for example, your credit card company—when you signed up for your credit card, you signed a boilerplate agreement. There is no way you read through that whole thing, but there was a forced arbitration clause in there. It says, in any dispute between us and the consumer, the dispute shall be decided by an arbitration.

What that means is that they can do anything they want to you. They can say, this month, in honor of it being April, we are going to charge everybody \$45 for no reason. Forty-five dollars goes on your bill. If you don't pay it, they start dunning you and hurting your credit record. They can do that just for fun.

What are you going to do? Are you going to go to court over it?

No. You are going to join a class action because nobody can afford to hire a lawyer where \$45 is the amount in controversy. That is why we have class actions, so the corporations don't get away with that monkey business.

In forced arbitration clauses, that precludes any possibility of going to court and, thereby, it precludes any possibility of a class action. That means a lot of wrong can happen in this country at the hands of unaccountable corporations. They can get away with it because there is no chance of a class action.

Well, I am here to raise my voice in support of something Mr. JOHNSON from Georgia has done. He has written something called the Arbitration Fairness Act, which remedies much of what I am talking about.

I am also here to stand up and add my voice in support of things that the administration has done: executive orders, either already done or in the works, in the Department of Education to combat forced arbitrations against for-profit universities; in the Department of Defense to combat actions of predatory lenders against our armed service men and women and our veterans; executive orders in the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to combat arbitration clauses such as the one I discussed about a credit card company; executive orders by the CMS, Center for Medicare Services, to combat abuses in arbitration clauses in nursing homes so that you wouldn't be able to bring a court case against a

nursing home because you signed on the dotted line when you put mom or dad in the home so no matter what they do to mom or dad, you can't go to court, you have to go to arbitration. CMS is working on an executive order to curb that abuse.

An executive order in the Department of Labor to enforce rules and laws about safe work places and fair pay to prevent these forced arbitration clauses from taking these cases out of the sunlight and into the dark back rooms of the arbitrations where goodness knows what is going to happen, and it is probably not justice.

We have a statue of Thomas Jefferson right outside these chambers, Mr. Speaker. Thomas Jefferson said: "I consider trial by jury as the only anchor yet imagined by man, by which a government can be held to the principles of its Constitution."

We need to honor those words of Thomas Jefferson, we need to honor the Seventh Amendment, we need to support Mr. JOHNSON in his Arbitration Fairness Act, and we need to support the administration with executive orders fighting these unfair and non-transparent mandatory forced arbitration clauses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CARTWRIGHT.

It is amazing that when you are standing across the yard with the fence in between you and your neighbor and you are telling your neighbor about that great day of fishing that you had and you are telling him about this fish that was that long, you can do as much lying about the length of that fish—sometimes you didn't even catch a fish—and it is okay to lie to your neighbor.

But it is different when you go downtown and go to the courthouse because at the courthouse you are going to testify, you are testifying under oath, subject to being held accountable for perjury if you lie.

But it is amazing that in a forced arbitration proceeding, there is absolutely no requirement that you be administered, or that a witness be administered an oath before they are allowed to testify. So, therefore, in an arbitration proceeding, the lever of perjury to force someone to tell the truth is not there and it hurts the pursuit of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CARTWRIGHT for his testimony and his statements today.

I would point out that last year, the New York Times published an exhaustive and in-depth investigative series that pulled back the curtain and catalogued the immense harms of forced arbitration. In part 1 of the series, which was entitled "Arbitration Everywhere, Stacking the Deck of Justice," the Times explored the rise and dramatic spread of forced arbitration clauses, their impact on American workers, consumers, and on patients. This investigation found that corporations crippled the consumer challenges

across a wide swath of harmful practices simply by banning class action litigation.

Furthermore, once corporations have blocked individuals from going to court as a class, the investigation found that most people simply dropped their claims entirely.

Why?

Because the amount in controversy was so small that it was not cost effective to hire a lawyer to go to court to recover such a small amount. The net result is that the corporate wrongdoers have escaped being held accountable because of these forced arbitration clauses, which equates to a ban on participating in class action litigation and, in some of those clauses, they had the words in there about class actions being bought.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ), my friend, who serves on the Ways and Means Committee. She is a former labor lawyer. She has had an interest in this issue of arbitration, forced arbitration, for a couple of sessions of Congress. She has introduced legislation that would outlaw forced arbitration agreements in nursing home contracts—you know, where we go to take our loved ones who have to be committed to a nursing home and we have no choice but to sign the contract which has the arbitration clause in it because all of the other nursing homes have the arbitration clause in them as well. Representative SÁNCHEZ has filed legislation that would get at that very unfair process.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. JOHNSON.

I rise today to join Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. CARTWRIGHT in bringing attention to the very unfair and deplorable practice of forcing people into arbitration.

In practice, what this consists of is generally those with more power, meaning very wealthy corporations, including confusing but legally binding language buried in the fine print of contracts, contracts that pretty much purveyed every aspect of our lives. This creates this insidious process in which people, in order to get a credit card or a cell phone or to put a loved one into a nursing home, have to accept the terms of this contract without really knowing what they are buying into.

I want to start by saying that the concept of arbitration is a great one. I strongly support the principles of arbitration and the arbitration process because arbitration can do many good things. It can clear court dockets, it can help provide a more swift resolution to a problem, and it can also reduce legal fees. Those are the benefits of a fair arbitration process. In many ways arbitration can be a great thing.

But—and this is the thing—people think that arbitration is this wonderful process. But what they don't realize is that buried in that fine print in forced arbitration, there can also be terms that limit the evidence that you

can introduce. If you are forced into arbitration, there can be limits on the damages that you can claim. It can exclude your ability to request a jury trial. And mandatory binding arbitration has to be entered willingly by both parties, not just the party with the greater economic power. But, in fact, they know that they hold that leverage over the average consumer so they put this kind of limiting language into these arbitration clauses all the time.

Many retailers, banks, and online services have forced arbitration clauses written into their contracts. These arbitration agreements can be forced on vulnerable parties who have little knowledge about what they are signing or what it means to sign away those rights. Frankly, most consumers have little or no choice in the matter because the contracts are “take it or leave it.”

□ 1800

Why does this hit so close to home?

My father has Alzheimer's, and at a certain point, he could not care for himself anymore, so we had to investigate nursing homes that could provide the kind of around-the-clock care that was required for him that my brothers and sisters and I simply could not.

Sadly, in the nursing home arena, this is where, oftentimes, mandatory—forced—arbitration clauses are buried in these contracts for the admission of your loved one. Loved ones who cannot care for somebody who is physically ill or frail, again, have no real choice in the matter. They need to find facilities to care for their loved ones because they, simply, cannot do it on their own.

That is why, in Congresses past, I introduced the Fairness in Nursing Home Arbitration Act. That legislation would make predispute mandatory arbitration clauses in long-term care contracts unenforceable, and it would restore residents and their families their full legal rights. What the legislation would do is say that you cannot force arbitration onto families who, in an emotional time and in a medical crisis, are looking for care for their loved ones. You cannot force them to sign something that they don't agree with or even understand. My bill would have allowed families and residents to have maintained their peace of mind as they looked for the best long-term care facilities for their loved ones.

For desperate families who are unable to provide the adequate care at home, the need for an immediate placement for their loved ones makes these contracts, basically, take it or leave it, which gives them no choice at all in the matter. Families who are in the midst of these painful decisions to place a parent or a loved one in a nursing home rarely have the time or the wherewithal to fully and thoughtfully consider what it is they are signing when they sign a contract that contains a mandatory arbitration clause.

They are not in a position to adequately determine what agreeing to such a clause will mean for their loved ones should the unthinkable happen.

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, CMS, is slowly working to include some of my bill's provisions through the regulatory process, but much work still remains in this area. In September of last year, Democrats sent a letter to CMS and called for a final rule that will ensure that nursing home residents will only enter into arbitration agreements on a voluntary and enforced basis after a dispute arises, not before.

We need commonsense solutions to forced arbitration agreements, solutions that would protect the average consumer, who is unfamiliar with the concept of arbitration and is not trained in the law. Many people may not even be aware of the rights they are signing away at a time when they are least prepared to make important decisions. As Members of Congress, we are called on to serve our constituents and to protect them from flagrant violations of their rights. We should be doing more to protect vulnerable families from these forced arbitration policies.

I thank my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON, for being such a strong voice on this issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman from California.

Next, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas, my good friend SHEILA JACKSON LEE, a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and the ranking member on the Crime Subcommittee. She is also a member of the Homeland Security Committee. She is a lawyer and a former judge.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his leadership, along with Mr. CONYERS, and for the introduction of a very important initiative, H.R. 4899.

Mr. Speaker, many would think, particularly as we have watched the mediation and arbitration process grow as a newly developed practice amongst lawyers and one that businesses and others have seemed to adopt, that that was, in fact, helping consumers by allowing the concept of arbitration to be able to be utilized, thereby, allegedly, lowering the costs of litigation.

In a 2010 survey, 27 percent of employers, covering over 36 million employees—or one-third of the nonunion workforce—reported that they required the forced arbitration of employment disputes. The practice of forced arbitration is widespread and damaging. For example, the ability to obtain key evidence that is necessary to prove one's case is often restricted or eliminated in arbitration proceedings, and it can be nearly impossible to appeal adverse decisions by arbitrators.

We know that, in the Bill of Rights in the Constitution, there is a right to a trial by jury, a jury of one's peers. Therefore, it is a sacred right. This new practice had been projected as helping

the victim: oh, it will be a low-cost procedure; you will get an immediate decision; you won't have the stress of litigation; you might not even have to hire a lawyer. But, as indicated, the ability to obtain key evidence that is necessary to prove one's case is often restricted or eliminated in arbitration proceedings, and it can be nearly impossible to appeal adverse decisions by arbitrators.

I was one of the first Members to bring attention to this issue when I prevailed upon the late Chairman Hyde to authorize the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative and Commercial Law, when I was the ranking member, to hold a hearing on that matter involving Carl Poston and the NFL Players Association, with Gene Upshaw, then executive director, in the LaVar Arrington case. You may recall the LaVar Arrington case as being of the former Washington Redskins football player who was forced into arbitration in order to resolve a contract dispute.

Forced arbitration of State and Federal employment discrimination laws is also harmful to women workers. In 2015, nearly 64,000 discrimination claims were filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under title VII, and more than 41 percent of those charges were for sex-based discrimination. Sex-based discrimination, including sexual harassment, remains a persistent problem for women in the workplace. Nearly 83 percent of sexual harassment charges that are filed with the EEOC are filed by women. Just imagine that mandatory arbitration of claims under State or Federal family and medical leave laws could have a disproportionate impact on women as well.

I am pleased that this legislation was introduced, because it is a legislative initiative to restore rights. The bill is rightly named the Restoring Statutory Rights Act. It is also, I believe, the restoration of constitutional rights. Let me quickly tell you of the case of Stephanie Sutherland, which illustrates the difficulties of this forced arbitration.

Stephanie was hired by her company to work as a staff assistant. Her work involved relatively routine, low-level clerical work for which she was paid a fixed salary of \$55,000. She routinely worked 45 to 50 hours per week, but because she was classified by her employer as exempt from overtime, she did not receive any additional compensation. By the time Ms. Sutherland was terminated in 2009, she had worked 151 hours of overtime for which she should have been paid \$1,867 had the Fair Labor Standards Act and the New York State labor laws been observed. She filed a class action lawsuit and sought to recover overtime for her work in excess of 40 hours a week and for other current and former non-licensed staff—one or two staff employees of the firm—who worked overtime.

When Ms. Sutherland was hired, she was given an offer letter that also pro-

vided, if an employment-related dispute arises between you and the firm, it will be subject to mandatory mediation. That was what the company attempted to do—enforce mandatory mediation. In her lawsuit, she attempted to enforce her rights because the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act had a provision to expressly permit lawsuits for minimum wage. To this end, the lower court was sympathetic to Ms. Sutherland's arguments. However, the United States Court of Appeals reversed, relying on the 2013 Supreme Court case.

Therefore, we do have a conflict in the issue of dealing with arbitration that is forced. This is the core of why this legislation is so very important. I believe that, if parties agree to engage in mediation and arbitration, Mr. Speaker, so be it; but if you choose to use the court system that is designed by the Constitution as one of the three branches of government that all Americans should have access to, I will make the argument that you should not be forced into arbitration or mediation.

I believe Mr. JOHNSON—and I look forward to joining him on his legislation—along with Mr. CONYERS, is really lifting up the Constitution to ensure that every citizen has access to the courts of this land to help decide their issues of conflict and to choose the forum which they desire to use. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I look forward to working with him on this very crucial constitutional issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to discuss the critical importance of an impartial and fair justice system, corporate accountability, consumer and employee protection, as well as the importance of enforcing laws on the books.

I would like to thank Congressman HANK JOHNSON (D-GA) for his leadership in putting forth this Special Order.

The practice of forced arbitration is widespread and damaging.

In a 2010 survey, 27 percent of employers—covering over 36 million employees, or one-third of the non-union workforce—reported that they required forced arbitration of employment disputes.

Although arbitration can be a valid and effective method of dispute resolution when both parties voluntarily agree to arbitrate, forced arbitration clauses that limit an employee's legal rights in a non-negotiable contract are abusive and erode employees' traditional legal safeguards.

For example, the ability to obtain key evidence necessary to prove one's case is often restricted or eliminated in arbitration proceedings, and it can be nearly impossible to appeal adverse decisions by arbitrators.

I was one of the first Members to bring attention to this issue when I prevailed upon Chairman Hyde to authorize the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative and Commercial Law to hold a hearing on that matter involving Carl Poston and the NFL Players Association (Gene Upshaw, Executive Director) in the LeVar Arrington case.

You may recall LeVar Arrington as the former Washington Redskins football player

who was forced into arbitration in order to resolve a contract dispute.

Forced arbitration of state and federal employment discrimination laws is especially harmful to women workers.

In 2015, nearly 64,000 discrimination claims were filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) under Title VII, and more than 41 percent of those charges were for sex-based discrimination.

Sex-based discrimination, including sexual harassment, remains a persistent problem for women in the workplace.

Nearly 83 percent of sexual harassment charges filed with the EEOC are filed by women.

In a national survey by ABC News and the Washington Post, one in four women reported experiencing sexual harassment, compared to one in ten men.

Mandatory arbitration of claims under state or federal family and medical leave laws could have a disproportionate impact on women as well.

Nearly 56 percent of employees who took time away from work to deal with a serious personal or family illness, or to care for a new child under the FMLA in 2012 were women.

If my colleagues fail to take necessary action, mandatory arbitration will continue to be a barrier to justice for workers.

I am pleased by the action of Mr. CONYERS and Mr. JOHNSON for their leadership on Tuesday, Equal Pay Day, for introducing a very important piece of legislation that will address these inequities, (H.R. 4899) the Restoring Statutory Rights Act, which I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of.

The Restoring Statutory Rights Act would ensure that when Congress or the states have established rights and protections for individuals, including protection against wage discrimination, that they are able to enforce these rights in court.

This bill amends the Federal Arbitration Act to prohibit mandatory pre-dispute, commonly known as "forced," arbitration agreements for claims rising under federal or state statute, the U.S. Constitution, or a state constitution.

The bill would further require that a court determines whether an agreement is unconscionable, legally invalid, or otherwise unenforceable as a matter of contract law or public policy.

Under current law, parties may resolve statutory claims, including claims rising under anti-discrimination statutes, through forced arbitration instead of the justice system.

This important legislation is a critical step in eliminating longstanding and unacceptable discrimination and barriers imposed on women and minority.

It should be noted that forced arbitration is a private system controlled by corporations to prevent corporate accountability.

Buried in the fine print of countless employment, cell phone, credit card, retirement, and nursing home contracts, forced arbitration eliminates Americans' access to the courts, tipping the scales of justice in favor of corporate wrongdoers.

When corporations force arbitration on individuals using nonnegotiable and many times unnoticed contract terms, it becomes an abusive weapon.

Forced arbitration means giving up the most fundamental legal protection: the right to equal justice under the law.

For decades, we have fought hard for dozens of laws that protect against discrimination based on age, sex, religion, race, disability, and unequal pay for equal work, such as the Civil Rights Act and the Equal Pay Act. But these laws are meaningless if unenforceable in court.

It's time to close the arbitration loophole that gives employers and businesses the right to ignore civil rights and consumer protection laws.

Although states have tried to address this problem through their consumer protection laws, the courts have interpreted the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA) to trump state laws leaving consumers very little recourse.

Arbitration can be a fair and effective method of dispute resolution when parties voluntarily agree to arbitrate.

When the choice of arbitration is post-dispute—and therefore understandable and voluntary—it is a fair process that parties choose willingly.

I call upon my colleagues to come together and pass legislation that would reinstate workers' ability to enforce their rights in a court of law and protect the rights of women and minorities.

More than 20% of employees are covered by mandatory arbitration clauses.

Tens of millions of consumers use consumer financial products or services that are subject to pre-dispute arbitration clauses.

Federal court statistics show that 17,977 labor claims and 35,965 civil rights claims were filed in 2012.

National Arbitration Forum (NAF) arbitrators ruled in favor of consumers in less than 0.2% of all cases (30 out of 18,075) heard.

These 30 victories only occurred in hearings where a consumer brought claims against a business; when companies brought claims against consumers, they were successful in hearings 100% of the time. The employee win rate after arbitration was 21.4%, which is lower than employee win rates reported in employment litigation trials (36.4% in federal court and 43.8% in state court).

In cases won by employees, the median award amount was \$36,500 and the mean was \$109,858, both of which are substantially lower than award amounts reported in employment litigation (\$384,223 for federal court litigation and \$595,594 in state court litigation.)

A 2015 study of federal court employment discrimination litigation by Theodore Eisenberg found that the employee win rate has dipped in recent years to an average of only 29.7 percent.

At the same time, another 2015 study found that the employee win rate in employment arbitration had also dipped in recent years, to an average of only 19.1%; similar dip in employee win rates has occurred in state courts.

58% settlement rate in federal court employment-discrimination litigation.

While recent research on mandatory arbitration found a 63% settlement rate across all employment cases in that forum.

In court, summary judgment motions were filed in 77% of the court cases, while summary judgment motions were raised in 48% of arbitrations.

The win rate was 32% lower in mandatory arbitration than in litigation.

Plaintiffs' overall economic outcomes are on average 6.1 times better in federal court than in mandatory arbitration (\$143,497 versus

\$23,548) and 13.9 times better in state court than in mandatory arbitration (\$328,008 versus \$23,548).

21.1% of employment cases in mandatory arbitration are brought by employees without legal counsel.

Damages from arbitration are 16% of the average damages from federal court litigation and a mere 7% of the average damages in state court—thus lawyers are reluctant to take cases that are subject to mandatory arbitration.

Whereas on average plaintiffs' attorneys accepted 15.8% of potential cases involving employees who could go to litigation, they accepted about half as many, 8.1% of the potential cases of employees covered by mandatory arbitration.

The first time an employer appeared before an arbitrator, the employee had a 17.9% chance of winning, but after the employer had four cases before the same arbitrator the employee's chance of winning dropped to 15.3%, and after 25 cases before the same arbitrator the employee's chance of winning dropped to only 4.5%.

The study results provide strong evidence of a repeat employer effect in which employee win rates and award amounts are significantly lower where the employer is involved in multiple arbitration cases where the same arbitrator is involved in more than one case with the same employer, a finding supporting some of the fairness criticisms directed at mandatory employment arbitration.

In the credit card market, larger bank issuers are more likely to include arbitration clauses than smaller bank issuers and credit unions. As a result, while less than 16% of issuers include such clauses in their consumer credit card contracts, just over 50% of credit card loans outstanding are subject to forced arbitration clauses.

In the checking account market, which is less concentrated than the credit card market, around 8% of banks, covering 44% of insured deposits, include arbitration clauses in their checking account contracts.

40% of the arbitration filings involved a dispute over the amount of debt a consumer allegedly owed to a company, with no additional affirmative claim by either party. In another 29% of the filings, consumers disputed alleged debts, but also brought affirmative claims against companies.

The average disputed debt amount was nearly \$16,000. The median was roughly \$11,000. Across all six product markets, about eight cases a year involved disputed debts of \$1,000 or less.

Overall, consumers were represented by counsel in roughly 60% of the cases, though there were some variations by product. Companies almost always had counsel.

Of the 1,060 arbitration cases filed in 2010 and 2011, so far as we could determine, arbitrators issued decisions in just under 33%.

In approximately 25%, the record reflects that the parties reached a settlement. The remaining cases ended in an unknown manner or were technically pending but dormant as of early 2013.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her tremendous, informative presentation, which is all based constitutionally as the great lawyer that she is.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachu-

setts, JOE KENNEDY, who is an esteemed member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank Congressman JOHNSON. I am honored to be here with the gentleman, and I thank him for his leadership on this important issue.

I thank, of course, Ranking Member CONYERS, who has for so long been a guiding light in our party on issues of justice.

Congressman, you and Mr. CONYERS together have been this Chamber's champions on civil rights and equality in our justice system. You are, once again, leading the fight as we call for reforms to an unjust and unequal arbitration system. I am grateful, and I thank you for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, at the foundation of our democracy is one simple promise: no matter who you are or where you come from or what you have done, you will be seen as equal before the law.

Thomas Jefferson, himself, wrote centuries ago:

The most sacred duties of government is to do equal and impartial justice to all citizens.

Forced arbitration, Mr. Speaker, is an affront to that duty—a manipulation of the justice system that tips our scales in the direction of influence, money, and power. It removes even the slightest veneer of fair treatment in cases ranging from sexual harassment and discrimination to loss of housing and shelter, to neglect and abuse inside substance abuse treatment centers and retirement homes.

When a plaintiff sits at an arbitration table across from a powerful corporation to challenge a fraudulent charge or to question its practices, the protections that we have spent centuries instilling in our justice system get washed away. There is no judge, no jury, no avenue for appeal. There is no justice at that table.

At the very moment you need to access our courtrooms most, you find yourself locked out, diverted to a room outside the scope of our judicial system and beyond the bounds of our laws. Without your choice or sometimes even knowledge, forced arbitration transforms a level playing field into an uphill climb. At that point, most Americans turn around; but for the few who muster the will or the resources to continue their cases, there is no guarantee to counsel, forcing them to face off against some of the most experienced legal minds in our country completely on their own.

The Arbitration Fairness Act would help remedy this profound shortcoming in our justice system and ensure that equal access to legal protection doesn't come along with a price tag. Mr. Speaker, that is one of the most fundamental promises we make in our country. I am grateful to Mr. JOHNSON for his leadership on the issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his wise words.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I congratulate the writers of The New York

Times' exposé, a three-part series on forced arbitration. The second part of the series examined the secretive nature of forced arbitration, and the third part of that series talked about the forced arbitration in the context of binding persons to arbitrate secular claims in religious tribunals, applying religious law.

□ 1815

I would strongly encourage those who are interested in this subject to look to The New York Times article because it gives you a good understanding of where we are as far as forced arbitration is concerned. I applaud the reporters for their groundbreaking work in writing that series and producing it.

Jessica Silver-Greenberg, Michael Corkery, and Robert Gebeloff have done yeoman's work. They have exposed a threat to the justice system that shakes the tenets of our very democracy to its core. They deserve the highest commendation that I can give them, and that is just simply a shout-out from the well of the House.

I understand that the Pulitzer Prizes for journalism will be announced this coming Monday. If I could nominate this series, I would certainly do so. I certainly support their nomination for that award.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), my good friend, the former mayor of Providence, Rhode Island, a lawyer in his own right, a member of the Judiciary Committee upon which I also serve and, also, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to particularly thank the gentleman for his extraordinary leadership on this very important issue of forced arbitration, which is denying many, many Americans the right to have their grievances heard.

I want to thank both Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. CONYERS for not only the legislation, but for continuing to raise this issue.

As many of my colleagues have said, forced arbitration denies individuals the most basic right to have their grievances heard fairly. No court, no lawyer, no judicial proceedings, all the things that we have over many centuries recognized as essential to the fair and impartial resolution of disputes.

But there is an area that I want to speak about in particular where forced arbitration, I think, is particularly damaging and particularly unfair.

In the coming weeks, I will introduce legislation that will protect the rights of our troops to pursue justice in our courts. My legislation will simply clarify the original intent of the Uniformed Services Employment Rights Act of 1994, also known as USERRA, and allow veterans and servicemembers to have their claims heard in court.

This legislation was intended to protect the men and women of the Armed

Forces from losing their jobs as a result of their service to our country. It specifically prohibits employment discrimination due to military service and guarantees benefits and reemployment rights to those who leave their civilian jobs to serve.

However, these rights have rapidly eroded in recent years. Employers are requiring their employees to sign forced arbitration agreements barring access to justice for servicemembers. As my colleagues have discussed this evening, these agreements are often heavily tilted toward the parties who insist upon them.

In mandatory arbitration, the employers can select the arbitrator and the location of the forum, and the avenues for appeal are entirely closed off. In many instances, these clauses are imposed by employers without the knowledge or consent of their employees.

While USERRA explicitly prohibits any agreement that limits any right or benefit provided under the statute, some Federal courts have misinterpreted the law to exclude procedural rights.

As a result, many of the 1.3 million brave men and women who serve in our military may return to civilian life without their jobs and without the ability to fully assert their rights in the courts.

This includes servicemembers like Javier Rivera, an Army Reservist who was deployed for 6 months only to learn that his job had been filled in his absence. Despite 900 job openings, his former employer claimed that he could not find a single open position for him upon his return.

Under these circumstances, USERRA should have provided some relief. At the bare minimum, it should have guaranteed him the opportunity to have his claim heard in a fair, objective forum. However, because of a forced arbitration clause in his contract, he had no access to the courts at all.

Denying our servicemembers and veterans this essential right directly conflicts with the intent of USERRA. By limiting their access to legal recourse, it represents a direct affront to all who serve in our military.

Our troops face many potential threats in service to our country. The last thing they should be concerned about is whether they will be able to keep their job.

A Nation that asks young men and women to defend this country with their lives should protect them from losing their livelihoods when they come home.

So I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to help preserve access to justice for our servicemembers and veterans and to recognize this is just one very powerful example of what the real damage and the gross unfairness of forced arbitration clauses do to millions of Americans.

I thank Mr. JOHNSON again for yielding, for his extraordinary leadership on

this issue, and for his fight to ensure that all Americans have access to the courts and fair resolutions of their grievances.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as this Special Order has powerfully documented, forced arbitration isn't open, isn't just, and isn't fair. Simply put, forced arbitration clauses have become an exculpatory mechanism to rig the justice system.

Arbitrators don't have to be lawyers. Their decisions are practically irreversible. There is no record kept of the proceedings upon which you could appeal. There isn't even a requirement that witness testimony be given under oath.

As The New York Times investigative series illustrated, arbitration can even take place in the offices of the party representing the defendant.

There is also overwhelming evidence that forced arbitration creates an unaccountable system of winners and losers through what is called a repeat player advantage process that favors corporations over one-time participants, such as individual workers and consumers.

An analysis of employment arbitrations found that workers' odds of winning were significantly diminished in forced arbitration.

In 2012, the Center for Responsible Lending likewise reported that companies with more cases before arbitrators get consistently better results from these same arbitrators. Why? Because they are the ones who refer cases to the arbitrators.

The arbitrators want to eat. They know that, if they rule against whoever is referring the cases to them, then that is going to cut short their ability to feed themselves.

And so they rule in favor of the hand that is feeding them, and that is arbitrators, who are not even required to be lawyers and who have a perverse incentive to favor the repeat business over the consumers or the worker that they will never see again.

I am particularly alarmed by the growing number of companies that hide forced arbitration clauses outside of the four corners of the document.

For example, General Mills included a forced arbitration clause in its privacy policy that bound any consumer who downloaded the company's coupons or participated in its promotions.

Under its new terms, consumers also waived the right to a trial simply by liking the company's page on Facebook or mentioning the company on Twitter. Can you imagine giving up your Seventh Amendment jury trial right on Facebook?

It has become an increasingly common practice to use gotcha tactics to deceive consumers and employees by providing so-called notice of binding arbitration in brochures, email and memoranda, job application forms, signs outside of restaurants binding you—if you set foot in there and consume, binding you to forced arbitration, in-store application kiosks, employee training programs, contests and

games associated with company promotions. People have to watch out. Even on the side of a cereal box you can waive your right to a jury trial.

Just imagine a child finding glass in their cereal, but because the company prohibited class action litigation through forced arbitration, the child's parents would have to individually not go to court, but go to an arbitrator to have their claim adjudicated.

What if it affected several thousand children? That same forced arbitration clause would prevent class litigation to ensure that our children's food is safe to eat.

These are actual cases where someone potentially lost their right to hold a company accountable for unlawful conduct in a public courtroom. In all of these cases, we are not even talking about an agreement with a dotted line.

I am reminded of Justice Kagan's dissent in *American Express v. Italian Colors* where she observed that the Federal Arbitration Act was never meant to be a mechanism easily made to block the vindication of meritorious Federal claims and insulate wrongdoers from liability.

The tides are turning. Americans are beginning to fight to restore their right to a jury trial. Policymakers are using every tool available to fix our laws so that corporations can no longer escape public accountability.

I thank my colleagues for their participation in this Special Order. Before I close, I want to also thank the Congressional Progressive Caucus for their tireless work to advance a progressive agenda of equality and opportunity for all.

I will close with this observation. The American people would fight back if someone came into their home and said: We are going to take away your Second Amendment right to bear firearms. They would fight.

But when corporations take away their Seventh Amendment right to a jury trial, they remain mum, but not for much longer.

People are standing up. People are tired. They are desiring change. They are angry and realize that they have been taken advantage of.

They want to level the playing field, and that is exactly what the legislation that we have introduced in this Congress will accomplish.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional debates on arbitration more than 90 years ago, witnesses testified about the benefit of resolving disputes without judicial intervention. They noted, for example, that when arbitration is properly used, it can help parties avoid the uncertainty, delay, and costs of protracted litigation. Their testimony ultimately led Congress to pass the Federal Arbitration Act of 1925, which empowered courts to enforce arbitration agreements.

As the use of pre-dispute forced arbitration agreements—especially with

respect to consumer transactions and employment agreements—has proliferated in recent years, however, it is clear that arbitration is not always beneficial to all parties and it may, in fact, eviscerate the protection of critical federal consumer and civil rights statutes. It is also apparent that the secrecy of arbitration awards can be used to hide awareness of wrongdoing by businesses. And, there are serious concerns about whether some arbitrators are indeed neutral.

The New York Times, in an excellent three-part series of investigative articles on the use of forced arbitration agreements published last year, reported that “clauses buried in tens of millions of contracts have deprived Americans of one of their most fundamental constitutional rights: their day in court.” Based on its exhaustive investigation of court records and hundreds of interviews with lawyers, judges, arbitrators, corporate executives, and plaintiffs, the Times found that arbitration practices are often closed, fail to adhere to rules of evidence or even substantive law, and are nearly impossible to appeal. The arbitration provisions that prohibit class actions, as the Times reports, are viewed by state judges as virtual ‘get out of jail free’ cards “because it is nearly impossible for one individual to take on a corporation with vast resources.” By privatizing the justice system, arbitration “bears little resemblance to court” and has become an “alternate system of justice” for businesses precisely because it tends to favor them, according to the Times.

Notwithstanding these concerns, the use of pre-dispute forced arbitration clauses has become virtually ubiquitous. They appear in credit card agreements, car rental agreements, and employee handbooks. They even appear in nursing home agreements when they are signed “at the time of admission only because the resident or family member does not even notice or understand the arbitration clause, or sign[ed] . . . out of fear that otherwise the admission will be jeopardized,” according to the National Senior Citizens Law Center.

Pre-dispute mandatory arbitration agreements do not offer any option to reject. Once signed, these agreements force consumers and employees to irrevocably waive their right to judicial redress for harms they have suffered, prevent them from availing themselves of any class action remedy, and deny them the right to otherwise obtain justice under applicable state and federal law.

As a result, millions of consumers and employees across our Nation are legally bound by forced arbitration clauses in contracts with little or no ability to negotiate them.

Accordingly, it is time for Congress to reconsider the value of pre-dispute mandatory arbitration agreements. We must restore integrity to the arbitration process and limit the enforce-

ability of mandatory arbitration clauses that provide no opportunity for consumers and employees to opt-out.

Congress should not restrict the rights and options of consumers and employees to resolve disputes. Rather, arbitration should be one option among many to resolve disputes. Legislation that protects consumers and employees is a common-sense solution for all Americans.

For example, H.R. 2087, the “Arbitration Fairness Act,” is an excellent measure that was introduced by my colleague, Representative Henry C. “Hank” Johnson, Jr. This bill would make pre-dispute arbitration agreements unenforceable in employee, consumer, civil rights, and antitrust disputes. Importantly, H.R. 2087 would leave arbitration in effect when it is truly voluntary: after a dispute arises.

Similarly, H.R. 4899, the “Restore Statutory Rights Act,” which was also introduced by Mr. Johnson earlier this week, would ensure that the rights and protections established by Congress or the states are enforceable in court.

These bills would help restore balance and fairness to contractual agreements by allowing consumers, employees, franchisees, residents of long-term care facilities, and others to opt for arbitration, rather than have arbitration imposed on them as a pre-condition. Such measures would help ensure a fairer arbitration process because the terms of arbitration.

Congress must do more to protect the right of consumers and employees to have access to the courts. Americans should not be forced to lose this precious right as a result of one-sided, pre-dispute mandatory arbitration agreements.

Mr. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of American consumers who are too often denied access to justice and forced into arbitration by contracts they were unable to negotiate fairly.

The Federal Arbitration Act was enacted to resolve disputes among businesses of equal standing; not to restrict consumer access to our courts. The horrific distortion of this law has allowed certain actors to tip the scale in their favor and create an uneven playing field in the pursuit of justice.

It is our responsibility to guarantee every American equal access to justice and protect the public from unfair and pernicious business practices. For this reason, I strongly support my colleague, Representative Hank Johnson's bill, the Arbitration Fairness Act. This bill would require that agreements to arbitrate employment, consumer, civil rights or anti-trust disputes be made only after the dispute has arisen. Consumers can only properly evaluate their options, and make a truly voluntary choice, after a dispute has arisen. Arbitration undeniably serves an important role in our legal system, but its use must be a choice, and not a mandate resulting from a one-sided contract.

Americans deserve to choose whether court, arbitration, mediation, or any other method of dispute resolution works best for them. I urge my colleagues to join me in guaranteeing all Americans this meaningful choice by cosponsoring the Arbitration Fairness Act.

HOLDING THE IRS ACCOUNTABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, tax day is fast approaching. If you, as a taxpayer, get audited and the IRS subpoenas documents from you, do you think you could destroy them and say: The heck with it? Could you lie to the IRS when they are asking you about your taxes and investigating you?

If somehow you unintentionally provided false information to the IRS, could you decline to correct the record once you found out that what you told them was not true? If you had a duty to comply with a lawfully issued subpoena, could you just fail to take basic efforts to comply?

I think every taxpayer in America instinctively knows that they would never be able to get away with the conduct I just outlined.

So I think the question that we here in this body have to answer is: Should the IRS be able to get away with conduct that a taxpayer would never be able to get away with? Can we really accept that the IRS gets to live under a lower standard of conduct than the taxpayers that the agency wields so much power over?

We know how this began. The IRS abused its authority. They targeted Americans based on their First Amendment beliefs. They got caught red-handed; so, Congress investigated.

Now, the Department of Justice was supposedly investigating, but that was baked in the cake from the beginning. They were not interested in this case. And, of course, they did not pursue prosecutions. Ultimately, even though Lois Lerner was held in contempt, they didn't pursue that even to the grand jury.

□ 1830

So Congress has tried to get to the truth of this, and Congress is even taking some action, like cutting funding for the IRS. Of course, when we cut funding, all they did was stop answering the phone calls. They didn't take it out of the bureaucracy. They just basically harmed the taxpayers.

So we are trying to get to the truth. We subpoena documents from the IRS, we bring in the Commissioner, John Koskinen, to testify, and we are trying to get the truth on behalf of the American people.

And yet, what has happened?

The IRS destroyed 400 backup tapes containing as many as 24,000 of Lois Lerner's emails that were under not one, but two congressional subpoenas.

Commissioner Koskinen came to the Congress and made multiple statements that are demonstrably false. He breached his duty to correct the record once it was clear that some of his statements were false, such as the fact that he said we will produce every one of her emails. Koskinen even claimed

that the IRS went to great lengths to ensure that Congress was given all documents, yet the IRS failed to conduct even basic investigation, such that the inspector general found a thousand emails that were in the IRS' possession all along. It took them 2 weeks to find it.

The IRS didn't look at Lerner's BlackBerry. They didn't look in other areas which were obvious that you would want to look at.

Great lengths?

Give me a break. As Judge David Sentelle noted today in the D.C. Circuit, it is hard to find the IRS to be an agency that we can trust.

So I think the question is: What is the remedy for them frustrating the American people's inquiry into their targeting of Americans?

I have argued, along with my colleagues here, that the appropriate remedy is found in the Constitution, which provides for impeachment of civil officers.

You have an IRS Commissioner who breached multiple duties that he owed to the public, and he violated the public trust, which is what Alexander Hamilton said was kind of the touchstone for what an impeachment should be in the Federalist Papers. Impeachment is not a prosecution or a punishment. It is really a constitutional check.

I think as you listen to some of the conduct that the IRS engaged in—my colleagues will go into more of it—obviously there is a need to get the truth, but there is also a need for this institution here to stand up for itself. It is really a question of the House's self-respect.

How much longer can we, as elected officials, allow the bureaucracy to simply walk all over the Congress?

We are supposed to be the people's representatives. We are supposed to be able to do justice for them when the government is not acting appropriately.

Fear of a media backlash or that people in the beltway will say you shouldn't be doing it, that is no excuse for our failure to discharge our basic constitutional duties.

As James Madison said: "Ambition must be made to counteract ambition." No government agency is above oversight and accountability by the people's representatives.

And so as it stands now, we have filed articles of impeachment that have basically been collecting dust for several months. We think they should be brought up on the Committee on the Judiciary and we should have a debate about whether this Commissioner's conduct satisfied the standards of conduct that the Founding Fathers envisioned for civil officers of the United States.

I think any taxpayer who looks at what the IRS did will instinctively say, you know, it just ain't right that they are able to get away with that when they are dealing with the Congress, but

I would never be able to get away with that when I am dealing with the IRS.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), my friend and colleague, a guy who has been really, really fearless on holding the IRS to account.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for organizing this Special Order, but more importantly, for the fight that he has waged in holding the IRS accountable and for saying to the American taxpayer, the American people, when you have individuals running an agency with the power of the Internal Revenue Service, doing what was done under Commissioner Koskinen's watch, he, in fact, should be impeached.

Let's just walk back through the story. Remember how this started. We had conservative groups around the country saying, hey, we are being harassed by the IRS for filing to get tax-exempt status, something that used to be kind of a matter-of-fact thing; we are being harassed for doing so.

So the Congress of the United States called for the inspector general to do an investigation. The inspector general does his investigation. It takes a long time. It takes about a year. They do an investigation and they find, you know what, our very own tax collection agency is, in fact, targeting citizens for their political beliefs. They find it. They find targeting took place. The inspector general of Treasury tells the Treasury officials and tells the IRS what they have discovered, and they are going to file their report the following week.

In an unprecedented move, Lois Lerner, the Friday before the report is supposed to be made public the following week, Friday, May 10, 2013, Lois Lerner does what all kinds of people do when they get caught with their hand in the cookie jar. She wants to get ahead of this story, so at a staged event, bar association event, staged question, planted question from a friend, she gets asked about the targeting and the inspector general's investigation, and she does what all kinds of people do when they get caught. She lies. She flat out lies. She tries to blame good public servants in Cincinnati. She said this was all about Cincinnati.

We all know what the evidence pointed to. It was about Washington. It was about the folks right here in the Internal Revenue Service.

The report comes out the following week. On the following Monday, 2 days later, the President of the United States and the Attorney General say this is inexcusable, and they call for a criminal investigation.

In fact, it is so bad, the President fires the then-Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service. They bring in an interim Commissioner. For a long time, we have hearings and a bunch of things happen. And, of course, one of the most noteworthy things is the very lady who was at the center of the storm, who lied when she first made

this public, gets brought in front of the Congress.

And what did she do?

She takes the Fifth. So when you have the central figure exercising their Fifth Amendment right, not willing to testify in public and answer the people's representatives' questions, it sort of puts a premium on getting the documents and the communications that the IRS had relative to this issue.

And so a long investigation ensues. Both a criminal investigation and a congressional investigation. Mr. Koskinen is then brought in as the Commissioner who is going to clean it all up, clean up this agency with so much power over American people's lives. He is brought in.

And guess what happens?

Everything Congressman DESANTIS just described. There are 422 backup tapes destroyed containing potentially 24,000 emails. Many of those emails most likely were Lois Lerner's emails that the American people and the Congress will never get a chance to see. They were destroyed, as Congressman DESANTIS pointed out, with three preservation orders in place. One from the IRS and the Treasury themselves. Another preservation order by the Justice Department saying preserve all documents, preserve everything. So three preservation orders, two subpoenas in place, and the Commissioner, under his watch, 422 backup tapes are destroyed containing 24,000 emails.

What does Mr. Koskinen do when he learns about problems with these tapes and problems with Ms. Lerner's hard drive?

He waits 4 months—4 months—before he tells Congress. Again, raising the obvious question—if you are a taxpayer being audited and you realize, oops, I lost some documents or I destroyed something, and you wait 4 months to tell the IRS what you did, oh, my goodness, you are in huge trouble.

But Mr. Koskinen, he is the cleanup guy, he is the President's hand-picked person, he is brought in. He thinks it is just fine that there are all these problems that he knows about.

Now, he didn't just wait 4 months and then tell us. In that time, when he first learned there were problems, he testified in front of Congress several times and didn't tell us. And then the worst thing is he provided false testimony, which, again, my colleague from Florida has pointed out. He said: Look, everything is fine.

And then finally, think about all the duties this guy, the guy brought in to clean up the mess, think about all the duties he had. A duty to preserve all the documents, particularly in light of the fact the central figure has taken the Fifth. A duty to produce them when they are asked for by the Congress. A duty to disclose to us if he couldn't preserve and produce them. A duty to testify accurately. And then, finally, a duty to correct the record if, in fact, he testified and said something that wasn't accurate. Every single

duty he had, he breached. Every single one.

Here is the final point I will make. And this is why—what Congressman DESANTIS, what Congressman HICE, and what Congressman LAMBORN are going to talk about is why this is so important, why this is so critical that this individual be brought in front of Congress. And, actually, we go through the articles of impeachment, and we exercise the right that the Constitution requires us to do of a situation of this magnitude.

Why it is so important is, remember the underlying offense. This is an agency with the power and influence that the IRS has systematically and for a sustained period of time targeting Americans' most cherished rights. You think about your First Amendment liberties: freedom of the press, freedom to petition your government, freedom to assemble, freedom to practice your faith, freedom of religion, practice your faith the way you think the good Lord wants you to. But under the First Amendment, your most fundamental liberty is your right to speak.

When the Founders put together the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and that First Amendment, when they were talking about your free speech rights, what they were mostly focused on was not just any old speech, any old talk, they were mostly focused on doing what we are doing right now, political speech, talking about politics, talking about government.

You have the right as an American citizen to speak out against your government and not be harassed for doing so. And yet, the IRS did just that. And that is why, Mr. Koskinen, that is why we filed these articles of impeachment and that is why we are asking that they move forward in the Committee on the Judiciary and we do what the American people sent us here to do.

I thank the gentleman from Florida who has done so much good work on this issue and a host of others.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of Representative DESANTIS and Representative JORDAN in holding the Obama administration accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to call for the impeachment of John Koskinen, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, for high crimes and misdemeanors. This effort is needed to hold the IRS Commissioner accountable for allowing documents to be destroyed and for providing misleading statements to Congress after IRS targeted conservative organizations. I am a cosponsor—and proud to be one—of the resolution. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

As it has become abundantly clear, Commissioner Koskinen has failed the American people by stonewalling con-

gressional investigations into the IRS targeting scandal. Conservative organizations were intentionally targeted by our Federal Government simply because they believed and expressed a message that was in opposition to the administration.

Now, while I may disagree with many on the left, I would never seek to threaten them by use of government force and coercion and take away their freedom of speech.

Moreover, what is truly disturbing about the IRS scandal is that Commissioner Koskinen has violated the public trust. As a Commissioner, he failed to comply with a congressional subpoena, failed to ensure that evidence was preserved, failed to testify truthfully, and failed to notify Congress when he learned that thousands of emails were missing.

Our constituents expect Congress to exercise oversight of this administration and to demand accountability. We know the IRS Commissioner cannot be trusted. Impeachment would help rectify this sorry situation and would go a long way toward showing the American people that we are serious about our constitutional duties.

Impeachment is the appropriate means to restore balance between the branches of government. The Framers included impeachment in the Constitution for precisely this scenario, where an executive branch official who violated the public trust will not resign and they refuse to fire him. That is exactly what should happen here. IRS Commissioner Koskinen must go.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we all know this time of year is when the American people are held accountable to pay their taxes. Unfortunately, the IRS—and especially its head Commissioner John Koskinen—have proven over and over and over that they cannot be trusted to hold themselves to the same standard that they hold the rest of us. It is critical that we, as Congress, as we are trying to do here this evening, that we ensure that the IRS is held accountable for its actions the same way the American people and other Federal agencies are held accountable for their actions.

House Republicans, my colleagues and I, many of us on the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in particular are very familiar with Commissioner Koskinen. Under his leadership, the IRS has failed to respond to multiple subpoenas for evidence. There has been destruction of thousands of key documents, thereby really hindering the work of Oversight investigations, possibly obstructing justice.

□ 1845

John Koskinen, as has already been mentioned here just moments ago, sat before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and lied

under oath multiple times, providing false and misleading testimony, which, of course, as we all know, is outright perjury.

John Koskinen's continued role as Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service—which we all know is one of those powerful Federal agencies—despite his continued attempts to deceive Congress and the American people, is nothing but the living embodiment that the IRS indeed does not play by the same rules that they demand of other Americans.

The American people are well aware that the IRS has placed itself above the law, above the rest of us. In fact, according to a recent Rasmussen poll, only about 30 percent of Americans actually trust the IRS to fairly enforce the law, which means that we have got nearly 70 percent of Americans who don't trust the IRS to abide by the law here in America. One of the most powerful agencies that we have cannot be trusted. And the American people don't trust them. This is a Federal agency that desperately needs to be set on the right track. Of course, the first step to that is eliminating the failed leadership.

So I join my colleagues on the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, many of whom are here this evening. I am proud to be a cosponsor of H. Res. 494 to impeach Commissioner John Koskinen. This is absolutely one of our most important roles in Congress: to hold our Federal agencies and heads of these agencies accountable.

So with that mission, I appreciate the gentleman for the opportunity to speak a few moments, and I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 494 to impeach IRS Commissioner John Koskinen.

Again, I want to thank my good friend, Congressman DESANTIS, for leading this Special Order.

Mr. DESANTIS. It is my pleasure to yield to one of my friends and colleagues from the great State of Florida (Mr. YOHO), who is really a stalwart in terms of bringing accountability to government.

Mr. YOHO. I would like to thank my colleague from my neighboring district, Mr. DESANTIS.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great moment in time and I appreciate the gentleman bringing this up. This is such an important issue that we all deal with and something that every American has a vested interest in. I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order this evening. The topic of tonight's discussion is an important one and one that demands attention by all Americans.

My district and I have never been a fan of the IRS. It is an agency that wreaks terror amongst the American people. And in a perfect world, we would eliminate it altogether, but that is not what we are here to talk about tonight. When you consider their actions over the past couple of years of

targeting conservative groups and individuals seeking nonprofit status or political ideology that doesn't agree with an administration, my desire to see this agency dismantled increases tenfold.

Although the focus tonight is the conduct of IRS Commissioner John Koskinen and his failure to perform his duty to respond to lawfully issued congressional subpoenas, let us not forget that the IRS scandal began back in 2010. 2010—over 6 years ago—this started.

And do you want to know why the frustration of the American people is so high, why they say, You guys don't ever change in Washington, you never hold anybody accountable?

We see the law being blatantly broken every day. Yet we stand here neutered, afraid to do something.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we stand up and hold those people that are breaking the law accountable. I know Mr. DESANTIS' goal is to do that, his committee's goal is to do that, and my goal is to help them accomplish that.

Many have accused Commissioner Koskinen of obscuring multiple congressional investigations into the IRS targeting of conservative groups seeking nonprofit status. Some argue that in the process of stalling and misrepresenting the facts to Congress, he has committed culpable misdemeanors.

If Commissioner Koskinen has deliberately misled the American people, Congress has the constitutional responsibility to hold him accountable to the American people.

Who else can do that?

Only this body has that power: the House of Representatives, the people's House. That is why our Founders instilled that power, that authority, that oversight with this body. The American people can't hold anybody accountable. It is us, the legislature.

And I support his impeachment. I feel that his agency completely went off the rails. And by doing so, I am proud to support JASON CHAFFETZ' House Resolution 494 asking for the impeachment of John Koskinen for high crimes and misdemeanors.

This is something that has only been used 19 times in our Nation's history: impeachment of a Federal official. Nineteen times in over 200 years. It is not something that is flagrantly used to throw people out of office because we don't agree with their political ideology. This is something that has been used very sparingly, and it is a tool that must be used when the time is right to use it. Mr. Speaker, I say the time is right. The American people want to see this done.

The resolution was introduced in October of last year, and we have yet to see it come out of the Judiciary Committee and onto the House floor. What is the holdup, is my question and that of a lot of other people.

We know the White House will not lift a finger. This White House and administration will not lift a finger to

hold anyone accountable, but why hasn't our own House leadership done more to bring this resolution to the House floor? That is my question. It is the question when I go home: Why are you guys not holding people accountable? Because if we don't hold ourselves accountable and we blatantly break the law, why should not the American people do that? This is to send an example that we cannot break the law. Because if we don't follow the rule of law, why should the American people?

The American people want answers and accountability in their government. As Members of the House, we have heard their cries and worked together to hold the Obama administration accountable. It is time we bring H. Res. 494 up for a straight up-or-down vote and do the work our constituents ask of us.

Just this month I held four town hall and teletown hall meetings, and one of the topics I heard over and over again was about government accountability. We hear it a lot: government accountability and transparency. We talk about it and hear about it, but don't see it.

Again, that leads to the frustration of the American people: Why aren't elected officials ever held accountable?

We have government agencies targeting American citizens for nothing more than a political ideology, their beliefs, ignoring our demand for information and flagrantly ignoring the law. This needs to end. We cannot change our Nation for the better if we do not change how business is done in Washington. Nothing in Washington will ever change if we don't start holding officials accountable.

We need to start here. We need to start now. And I urge my colleagues to support the impeachment of John Koskinen. This is something not taken lightly. Again, I want to reiterate it has been used 19 times in over 200 years. I urge my colleagues to support the impeachment of John Koskinen and to continue to hold strong against this and future administrations that disregard the law, the Constitution, and the people of this great Nation.

Mr. DESANTIS. I appreciate my friend from Florida. Those were very well-received comments.

I would also like to just mention that Mr. PALMER from Alabama—who is serving up there—and I were discussing before he had to go up and serve in that duty—and I think it was a good point: if this were a private business and the private business had behaved this way—in the face of the IRS—the CEO would have been fired because it just would have been absolute hell for the company.

And that is one reason why the American people are so frustrated with government. There are different standards that apply for people in Washington versus the rest of the American people and the taxpayers. And that is just totally intolerable in a Republican form of government.

And I make one other point that I think sometimes gets lost. When you start talking about what are impeachable offenses, people tend to think of it in terms of criminal offenses. And while there are criminal offenses that would qualify as impeachable offenses, the two are not mutually exclusive. And, in fact, the Founders believed that the real reason you needed impeachment was for things that may not necessarily be criminal, but that were breaches of the public trust.

Joseph Story, the preeminent Supreme Court Justice, noted that:

Impeachable offenses are aptly termed political offenses growing out of personal misconduct or gross neglect or usurpation or habitual disregard for the public interest. They must be examined upon very broad and comprehensive principles of public policy and duty.

I think that is tailor-made for this instance. Some of the false statements maybe do violate statutes, but we don't have to get into that. We can simply say: Has he violated, has he shown a disregard for the public interest, has he been—even grossly negligent would be actionable—and I think that is clearly the case here.

I echo my friend from Florida that said we need to get the dust of the impeachment resolutions, we need to get it up to Judiciary and pass it out, and then let's let the House make a decision about whether that is valid or not.

Some people say: Well, the Senate may not want to do it. They will have to defend their votes then. And that is fine with me. I think most Americans want the IRS to live at least under the same standard they do. I think it should be a higher standard, given all the power they have.

I appreciate my colleagues for coming and discussing this issue. The articles have not been brought up, but we are not forgetting, many of our constituents are not forgetting, and really the time to act is now. If we don't—this is absolutely true—the IRS will have gotten away with everything. That is unacceptable.

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

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 30 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge that Congressman TIM RYAN of Ohio and Congressman RICK NOLAN of Minnesota had scheduling conflicts. They were here earlier, and we thought this Special Order would start earlier. And I want to say thank you to both of them so very much for their strong support of the pension benefit rights of America's workers and retirees.

Tonight I rise to bring a very serious situation to the attention of the Amer-

ican people, a situation that demands justice. It relates to something called ERISA, or the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, passed decades ago that says when workers work and accrue benefits for retirement, those are sacrosanct. They are earned benefits and no one can cut them. ERISA promises that those retirees will receive the earned benefits that they worked so hard for.

Mr. Speaker, I want the American people to know that today I stood with thousands of America's workers out here on the lawn facing the Capitol. American retirees, their families, and supporters are here in our Nation's capital to save their hard-earned pensions that should be guaranteed under the laws of this country. They are here in Washington because Congress abandoned them. They were abandoned by the executive branch, too.

What has happened is that hundreds of thousands of American workers are getting notices in the mail. These are current beneficiaries, people who are already retired, who are getting notices that their pensions are being cut by half, by 30 percent, some as much as by 70 percent under something that passed here in the Congress called the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act.

But it didn't pass on its own, as a freestanding piece of legislation. It was stuck in a gigantic bill—we call it a must-pass bill—that, in December of 2014, if it had not been passed, the government would have shut down. The problem is most Members of Congress had no idea that was even in that bill. That section was airlifted into what was called the CR/Omnibus, the continuing resolution appropriations bill of that year. But on the section that dealt with pension rights, which had nothing to do with the appropriations process or the continuing resolution, these pension cuts were dropped in. There was no floor debate, there was no separate debate on that issue.

□ 1900

There were no amendments allowed. People, Members didn't even know what was in that section of the bill.

So that Multiemployer Pension Reform Act, they call it MPRA, was supposed to solve one crisis, and that is a shortage in the funds currently in that particular pension fund; but it placed the solution on the backs of the workers, the people who had earned those benefits themselves. Retirees who never caused the financial shortfall are going to bear the entire burden of the shortfall in that fund.

In reality, people in Ohio—just who were Ohio Teamster retirees, nearly 48,000 retirees in Ohio, the State most impacted in the union—are now getting notices that their pensions are going to be cut. Overall, there are over 270,000—a quarter million—Teamster retirees, alone, across our country who are being affected; and, of course, some of them were with us today.

Over the last year, I have heard extensively from retirees who will see

their pensions dramatically reduced—dramatically reduced—if, in fact, these cuts are approved by the U.S. Treasury Department.

These Americans did everything our country asked them to do as productive citizens. They went to work. They worked for decades. They worked for companies that matched that money, and they thought they would have a secure retirement—guaranteed. The law says, under ERISA, their retirement income will be guaranteed. But now it is a promise not being kept, and they are facing a stark reality. These workers earned their benefits. No one has the right to take them away.

Imagine working for 30 years as a truck driver, where your work takes you away on long trips for weeks at a time—time away from your family, time away from your community, countless missed family gatherings and life moments you will never get back, but you are a good worker so you do it. It is a good job with good pay, a solid middle-class living, a chance to make life better for your family and children, and, with it, all the promise of a reasonable and secure retirement in later years, if you can make it, doing that hard work.

Imagine that you retire with your earned, predictable pension you have worked for your whole life. You are in your seventies, and a hastily passed government law reduces your pension from \$3,500 a month to \$1,400 a month—poof, just like that, through no fault of yours. You did everything you were supposed to.

This example is not the exception of what is happening to the American people; it is the rule.

Now, let me tell you, truck driving is hard work. It is debilitating on bodies, the bouncing, hopping out of that truck, many workers having to load the truck, as well as drive the truck, and then unload the truck, leaving many of these retirees disabled from work they did for 20 and 30 years.

I hear countless stories of how retirees are caring for their children, some of whom who have disabilities, supporting their own ill and aged parents, or supporting children and grandchildren with life expenses which, the last time I looked, aren't going down.

Electric bills are up. Food is up. It is not so easy to make it in retirement years. These pension cuts impact more than just the individual who earned the pension. Literally, these cuts impact millions of Americans and the communities in which they reside.

The House has continued to let these retirees down in its failure to hold even a single hearing to fully understand their financial plight. Can you imagine that? A federally guaranteed income secured, been in the law for years, now you have got hundreds of thousands of Americans impacted and Congress is dead as a doornail. They are not doing their job, even as these workers face these tremendous cuts.

Now, one of the major funds that is affected was called Central States, and

it was the first fund being affected—where its workers, pension retirees, were being affected—that filed an application with the Treasury Department to restructure benefits. But that application is only the first of many funds, pension funds, that will seek cuts in the years ahead.

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation reports that 150 multiemployer plans—covering a million and a half participants—are in grave risk of insolvency. With those cuts, entire communities will feel the economic impact.

What is more shameful is this was caused, in large part, by the role played—get ready—by the large, multinational banks. Let me list three of them for you: Morgan Stanley, Goldman Sachs, and Northern Trust. You see, the Central States Pension Fund is the only major private pension fund where all the discretionary investment decisions are made by financial firms, not our government. There was a court order from 1982 that has made the decisions for the retirees' billion-dollar fund. So the government basically turned this money over to the big banks.

Does this sound familiar?

This was the result of the Department of Labor wresting control of the fund, back in the eighties, away from organized crime, who used funds as their own piggy bank to build parts of Las Vegas. But the real irony here is that the Teamsters' pension fund disappeared more quickly under Wall Street than it did under the mob. How about that?

Ask the retirees how they feel, and they will tell you they got their money under the mob control. And I am not arguing for mob control. I am arguing for fair treatment of pensioners in our country and getting the money they earned.

Time has not been friendly to the trucking industry, with deregulation decimating good-paying jobs in trucking companies across the country and bankruptcy laws allowing hundreds of companies to exit the fund without paying their full withdrawal liabilities.

Lots went wrong by the big shots making the decisions, but the people paying the price over this 30-year period are the workers, and that is wrong. That is wrong.

The fund was hit particularly hard by the turmoil in the markets during the dot-com bubble and then followed by the Great Recession and financial crash during 2007 and 2008. Guess what. The fund, the pension fund, lost nearly 40 percent of its assets as it appears to have been overly invested in risky assets by Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, and Northern Trust.

We are calling for a forensic audit of what happened every year with the investments of this fund and who did it, who benefited, and now, who is being asked to pay the price.

How tragic that Congress will bail out the big banks, but then they will

throw millions of truck drivers and middle-class retirees who worked hard for a living under the bus—or under the truck.

Central States will tell you that these dynamics have caused the shortages, but the handwriting has been on the wall for a rather long time. While other funds diversified and recruited additional employers, something happened in this fund that is atypical. But why should the workers be blamed for what the managers and the bankers did?

Immediately after that law was passed, called MPRA, I set to work to correct the unfairness to America's workers and introduced H.R. 2844, the Keep Our Pension Promises Act. It now has nearly 50 cosponsors—50.

The idea here is—we call it KOPPA—the Keep Our Pension Promises Act would prevent these draconian cuts to the earned pensions of our workers by filling the financial gap in the fund and reinstate the “anti-cutback” provisions in ERISA, the bedrock of that law.

We have to keep our promises. ERISA promised that pension benefits in multiemployer plans would be cut only when a plan runs out of money; and even then, the benefit of the retirees should be the last to be cut, not the first to be cut.

No wonder that the middle class is mad at Washington. No wonder we see this Presidential race that is occurring, where there is a lot of hubbub around the country. The public is sick and tired of Washington doing this kind of thing to the American people. The public sees that this is just another broken promise by Washington and another rigged bill that went through here by the top leaders in Congress that most Members didn't even know was in there.

The system is rigged. A Senator from the other body said that. Well, by golly, on this one, in terms of benefits of pension retirees, it sure is rigged.

There are more than a million honest Americans who, for decades and decades, worked hard. They followed the rules, and they are now getting thrown to the wind by their own government.

Imagine if Congress were to cut Social Security benefits in the same way, by two-thirds, in a retiree's monthly pension payments. There would be riots in the streets.

My colleagues, if you ever wonder why tens and tens of millions of Americans are angry, deeply disappointed, and feel betrayed by their government, look no further than this issue.

I want to say to all the Americans who drove across the country today to be with us here in Washington, to spend the money for that gasoline, to take time away from their families—frankly, some of the men and women who were there couldn't even stand up on the lawn. They had to sit along the concrete fences along the side because their bodies simply can't hold them up as they did when they were younger.

We can do better than this as a country.

The bill that we are offering, H.R. 2844, basically would tax some of the assets of the most wealthy in our country and fill the gaps between now and 10 years from now so these workers wouldn't have to take these cuts. It is truly unfair to them.

It is time we operate, in this Congress, with the oversight that this institution was built upon. It is time for the committees of jurisdiction to do their job. Give these Americans, who are patriotic people—many of them are veterans. Many of them have served our country so ably in so many ways. They have been good family people. They don't need to have their benefits cut in their retirement years.

It has caused such havoc in these families, the worry alone, the blood pressures that have gone up and the heartache and the lost sleep of losing what they worked for their entire life. What is happening to them is wrong. It is not just.

It is time for the Treasury Department to deny the Central States application to cut benefits, and it is time that this Congress keep our pension promises to the American people who worked so hard, paid their taxes, helped build their families, helped build their communities, had a great work ethic, went to work every day, many of them getting up real early before the sun even rose. And now to treat them like this, in their golden years, how wrong is this?

I am so proud to rise on this floor this evening to speak on their behalf. They deserve a better day. I expect the people in this Congress and I expect the executive branch to dole out justice fairly to them and not make them the victim of the bad decisions that were made by the biggest banks in this country and by the managers of those funds that these workers dutifully paid their dues into over the years, coming out of their check every pay period. It is not right to cut their benefits. They do not deserve this.

Those funds need additional time to recover following that 2008 crash. You don't recover in 7 or 8 years, not from that kind of downfall in the economy. Why make the workers pay for the mistakes of others? It is just so wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to come down here this evening urging my colleagues to support the Keep Our Pension Promises Act, to urge them to sign onto our bill, H.R. 2844.

I say to those workers and retirees across our country who are likely listening: Keep up the faith. Keep writing your Representatives. Keep writing the U.S. Treasury Department, Mr. Ken Feinberg, who is in charge of this solution.

We want to make sure that justice prevails; and if we speak out, if we don't give up, if we make sure we stand up and talk to our Senators, talk to our Representatives, talk to all the Presidential candidates coming

through our States, across our country, during this year, this Presidential year, we can impact this policy.

Both political parties should have in their platforms this year that they will be writing come this summer that the Keep Our Pension Promises Act should be passed, that we should take care of these retirees and not permit them to lose the earned benefits that they spent their lives devoted to and now, in their later years, are facing these draconian cuts.

It is so wrong. I ask for justice for these American workers. Let's do what is right for them. And I know the people listening tonight agree, and they would do the same thing if they were standing down here on this floor with me.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for allowing me to speak out this evening and to stand alongside the hardworking men and women of our country. They deserve better treatment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HOLDING THE IRS ACCOUNTABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on the comments of my dear friends' Special Order earlier by Congressman RON DESANTIS.

I know there were a number of people who spoke, but the ones I actually saw and heard—Congressman DESANTIS, a dear friend, dear friend TED YOHO, and my dear friend JIM JORDAN—did an extraordinary job of laying out why we simply have to show that this House has standards, that Congress has rules, and you can only thumb your nose so far. You can only lie and defraud and, in some ways, be incompetent before there has to be an impeachment.

And with regard to the head of the Internal Revenue Service, the case has been made very effectively in the prior Special Order. So I want to add on to that by reference to this article from the Washington Examiner entitled, "IRS Chief:"—basically, the IRS chief is saying this; this is the headline—"Agency Encourages Illegal Immigrant Theft of Social Security Numbers to File Tax Returns."

□ 1915

It is by Rudy Takala, dated April 12.

It says, "The IRS is struggling to ensure that illegal immigrants are able to illegally use Social Security numbers for legitimate purposes, the agency's head told senators on Tuesday, without allowing the numbers to be used for 'bad' reasons."

Now, that is the IRS director's reasoning. It is okay for someone illegally in the United States to be engaged in identity theft.

This is the IRS director that has presided over the massive manipulation of

the Internal Revenue Service as a tool of this administration and the Democratic political party back in 2012 to prevent conservative groups, groups whose one foundational basis was the Constitution as written, groups who believed that people should follow the law.

This director's IRS targeted such people and, in some cases, kept them from getting a tax ID number and a verification that they could raise money. They kept them from participating in the 2012 election because President Obama was up for reelection, of course.

And now he has the gall to go before a Senate committee and testify that it is okay for someone illegally in this country that is involved in identity theft to use fraudulently someone else's Social Security number as long as it is not for a bad purpose.

If there has ever been a good reason to remove a department head, it certainly exists with the IRS Commissioner John Koskinen.

The article goes on and says that he made the statement in response to a question from Senator DAN COATS, a Republican from Indiana, during a session of the Senate Finance Committee about why the IRS appears to be collaborating with taxpayers who file tax returns using fraudulent information. Senator COATS said that his staff had discovered the practice after looking into agency procedures.

This is Senator COATS being quoted: "What we learned is that . . . the IRS continues to process tax returns with false W-2 information and issue refunds as if they were routine tax returns, and say that's not really our job. We also learned the IRS ignores notifications from the Social Security Administration that a name does not match a Social Security number, and you use your own system to determine whether a number is valid."

He is talking about the IRS.

So if we are just talking about strictly the issue of competence and not even getting into lies, fraud, deception, violating court orders, violating congressional orders, violating his own department directives—if we are just talking about an issue of competence and the Internal Revenue Service utilizes Social Security numbers in order to determine whose tax return is being filed and processed and he has the unmitigated gall to say: Now, when the Social Security Administration that issues these numbers tells us that person is filing a tax return and the information that they have given the IRS is false, it is fraudulent, it is not their number, it is not their tax return, it is not their tax information, the head of the IRS, Mr. Koskinen, says: We don't trust the Social Security number—that is basically what he is saying—we don't trust the Social Security Administration on whether or not it is a valid Social Security number when they tell us it is clearly not a number that belongs to the person that is filing that return. We go by our own information.

Now, how in the world could the Internal Revenue Service have more valid information about a taxpayer's Social Security number than the Social Security Administration that issued the number, maintains the number, and updates their records regarding who is using that number?

Giving the benefit of the doubt, maybe it is not incompetence. Maybe it is just so much unbridled arrogance that he honestly believes that nobody can be right except his department because he is the head of it.

The article goes on: "Asked to explain those practices, Koskinen replied, 'What happens in these situations is someone is using a Social Security number to get a job, but they're filing their tax return with their [taxpayer identification number].' 'What that means,' he said, 'is that they are undocumented aliens . . . They're paying taxes. It is in everybody's interest to have them pay the taxes they owe.'"

"As long as the information is being used only to fraudulently obtain jobs," Koskinen said, "rather than to claim false tax returns, the agency has an interest in helping them. The question is whether the Social Security number they're using to get the job has been stolen. It's not the normal identity theft situation," he said.

"The comments came in the broader context of a hearing on cybersecurity in the agency. About 464,000 illegally obtained Social Security numbers were targeted by hackers in a February cyber breach of the agency, while information on 330,000 taxpayers was stolen in an unrelated breach last year."

Koskinen "added that the agency wanted to differentiate that 'bad' misuse of personal data from other uses. 'There are questions about whether there's a way we could simply advise people . . . A lot of the time those Social Security numbers are borrowed from friends and acquaintances and they know they've been used, other times they don't.'"

So, apparently, people at the IRS, like Lois Lerner, don't mind violating the law, don't mind violating their oath, don't mind violating the very instructions for doing their jobs, and don't mind people—apparently, Koskinen doesn't—mind people that have violated the law to come into this country and have violated the law by possessing and using a stolen Social Security number without regard to whether they actually stole it themselves. No problem there as long as they are using it, apparently, to pay taxes.

What he doesn't say is that what these returns normally do—from what I can glean, they are not using fraudulent Social Security numbers to say: IRS, we want to pay more taxes into the U.S. Treasury. So just look the other way while we use a fraudulent or a stolen identity, a stolen Social Security number. Just look the other way because we are going to send you some more money.

Isn't that wonderful? What gratuity. What a wonderful spirit that someone would break our laws to come into this country, then steal somebody's Social Security number, and then be so gracious as to say: Now, I am filing my tax return because I want you to know I want to pay more taxes fraudulently in somebody else's name.

That is normally not why somebody would file a tax return at the end of the year using a stolen Social Security number.

No. Normally, you would file that to get money back from the government. You violated all kinds of laws. So why not violate one more to get a nice check back from the government?

Is it too much of a stretch to think that perhaps, if somebody will violate the laws of the United States to come into the United States, they will refuse to comply—like millions of American immigrants have that, thank God, have wanted to come into America, have made America better, have come in and followed the law—no. These want to come in illegally and use stolen Social Security numbers.

Again, is it too much to think, perhaps, if they are willing to perjure themselves using a stolen Social Security number, willing to file a fraudulent tax return that is not really theirs or the name or number on it is not theirs so that they are guilty of perjury, they are guilty of Internal Revenue fraud—is it too much to think they might just be willing to claim some exemptions and to claim some tax credits that they are not really owed so that they get a big old check back from the Federal Government?

□ 1930

I mean, why not ask for a big tax return, tax refund from your return after you have already violated so many laws of the United States? Yet the man whose oath of office should have had him rooting out stolen Social Security numbers and making sure taxpayers are not defrauding the U.S. Government, that they are not getting refunds back they are not owed, couldn't he go ahead and do that and protect Americans from identity theft? No, apparently not.

So Americans aren't protected. Their information clearly has not been adequately protected with the Internal Revenue Service under Koskinen's control. So Americans are at risk, especially if they are law-abiding and want to keep their information protected, because we have a head of the IRS that thinks it is okay if you are illegally in the country and filing fraudulent tax returns and using stolen identities, it is okay if you are simply trying to file your tax return. But, of course, how many of them really are getting refunds? That is why they are filing the fraudulent return using a stolen Social Security number.

Well, I know, having handled thousands of felony cases in Texas that came through my court and having no-

ticed over the years that juries feel the same way, if you will lie repeatedly or break laws of moral turpitude repeatedly, isn't it just kind of fundamental that you might be willing to lie in order to get some money back? Juries thought so, repeatedly. I thought so in numerous cases.

As we know from the rules of evidence—it should also apply to life, and it should apply to government investigations—that rule is credibility is always an issue. If somebody would use a stolen Social Security number or commit perjury in filing a tax return, provide fraudulent information, they might just be willing to put in a number, too, that is also fraudulent in order to get that big check from the United States taxpayers that actually worked and didn't steal anybody's Social Security number.

Is it any wonder why the American people are so stirred up against what is perceived as an establishment involving both parties in Washington, D.C., when we have this kind of contempt for honesty and honor and following the law and for tax returns and tax refunds from a man that is head of the IRS that needs to be impeached and removed from office?

I applaud my friends for making the case they did. They didn't touch on this particular area, but it really brings the gavel down. As litigants often said in front of me as a judge, "I rest my case." Mr. Koskinen needs to go.

Now, in talking about immigrants who have come in illegally, we have an article from CNS News, Terence Jeffrey, this month: "Obama Claims Power to Make Illegal Immigrants Eligible for Social Security, Disability." The article asked the question: "Does the President of the United States have the power to unilaterally tell millions of individuals who are violating Federal law that he will not enforce that law against them now, that they may continue to violate that law in the future, and that he will take action that makes them eligible for Federal benefit programs for which they are not currently eligible due to their unlawful status?"

I recall sitting right back there on the aisle, my friend JOE WILSON was sitting right over in the middle of this section over here, and the President was standing at this second level here, because that is where non-Members of the House have to stand to address this body if they are invited, as he was. He made statements about how his bill would not provide health insurance or healthcare provisions for people that were illegally here for abortion. My friend JOE WILSON just erupted—such a righteous man, he couldn't contain himself—and yelled out, "You lie."

Now, we have House rules—and I know every time I bring this up or talk about this House rule against my friends in the Parliamentarian's office, paying real close attention to make sure I don't violate the rule myself,

well, they start listening very carefully. Well, they always listen carefully, but even more carefully.

But in talking hypotheticals, if a President or someone speaking officially in this House to either the House or a joint session makes a statement—and I am talking hypothetically. I am not saying the President did because I know that would violate the rule. But hypothetically, if he made a statement that is a bald-faced lie and somebody points out that it is a lie and it turns out the person that said it is a lie is 100 percent right, it makes you wonder about the propriety of the rule if the rule says somebody is lying and somebody else points it out, and the one that points it out is at fault.

We do get into some tricky issues when it comes to areas of impeachment because it is real hard to make a case for impeachment if you can't talk about somebody that is in a position of authority in the Federal Government having violated the law in order to justify the term of high crimes and misdemeanors. So it gets kind of delicate in here at times trying to figure these things out.

But regardless of whether anybody thinks the President lied or told the truth, I am not getting into that because I don't want to violate the House rule while I am trying to make my point. But here in this room, the President said basically people who are illegally here, they are not going to get the health insurance and not going to pay for abortion.

Well, we know not only is it paying for abortion, but this administration will actually go to court and come after the Little Sisters of the Poor, these precious nuns who committed their lives to helping people less fortunate, basically a vow of poverty. They don't live lavishly. Their lives, like Mother Teresa's, are intended to better other people's lives.

And this administration decides it is not the people that are violating our laws of immigration that they are going to come after, it is not people that steal Social Security numbers to use them to get refunds fraudulently from the American taxpayers, they want to litigate with the Little Sisters of the Poor. They want to litigate with Christians devoted to helping others but who believe with deeply held religious beliefs like so many of our Founders had, like the Founders of Harvard and Yale had when they required students basically to take a pledge of allegiance that the most important aspect of life is living for Jesus Christ, our Savior and Lord. And you go back and look at those oaths.

But not this administration. To them, it is more important to go after some precious, sacred, caring nuns who say: We will do anything, we will lay down our lives for others, but you can't ask us to take actions that will provide for abortions because we deeply religiously believe that violates our Biblically-based beliefs, so please.

No. This administration will meet them at the Supreme Court and demand these nuns give up their religious convictions, give up what they have dedicated their lives to stand for. Why? Because to them an abortion is more important.

As I am running out of time, I want to also call attention today to something that became very important to me, having visited Nigeria to visit with a couple of dozen or so moms of daughters who were kidnapped by Boko Haram, basically shedding my State Department protection so I could go 2 or 3 hours to meet with them because they wouldn't initially come into the city to do that, having prayed with them and their pastor, wept with them and a few girls that were able to escape.

It was 2 years ago tonight that 276 schoolgirls were kidnapped by radical Islamists not because they were girls on this occasion. They do believe girls are inferior. They can't bring themselves to accept what we here know: we are equal in God's eyes. In some ways, ladies are superior, but not to Boko Haram, not to radical Islamists. They are basically property. The school was not attacked because they were girls. I asked that. No, they can't stand girls. They see them as property, something to be raped and traded into sex slavery. But the reason they attacked the school is because it is a Christian school.

Having talked to leaders there, religious leaders, and learning that our administration not only has done nothing significant to help them get their girls back other than launch a campaign based on #bringbackourgirls, but we haven't given them the information they need to get the girls released. We don't have to send troops, put boots on the ground.

□ 1945

There are things we could do to help them; but according to the information we have gotten, this administration says: Well, if you want our help in getting these precious girls released, you are going to have to start to change your law and allow for gay marriage. Also, you are going to have to start paying for abortions.

As a Catholic bishop in Nigeria said: Our religious beliefs are not for sale to President Obama or to anybody else.

God bless him. God strengthen him. Our tribute goes to those families. We need to do more to help them. Two years ago today, that horrible thing occurred.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and April 15 on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 483. An act to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 2512. An act to expand the tropical disease product priority review voucher program to encourage treatments for Zika virus.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 15, 2016, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5040. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, CMCS, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program; Deadline for Access Monitoring Review Plan Submissions [CMS-2328-F2] (RIN: 0938-AS89) received April 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5041. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting two reports entitled "U.S. Assistance for Palestinian Security Forces" and "Benchmarks for Palestinian Security Assistance Funds", pursuant to Public Law 113-235; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5042. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report pursuant to Sec. 2(9) of the Senate's Resolution of Advice and Consent to the Treaty with the United Kingdom Concerning Defense Trade Cooperation (Treaty Doc. 110-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5043. A letter from the Special Counsel, U.S. Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5044. A letter from the Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the FY 2014 annual report on reasonably identifiable expenditures by Federal and State agencies for the conservation of endangered or threatened species, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1544; Public Law 93-205, Sec. 18 (as added by Public Law 100-478, Sec. 1012); (102 Stat. 2314); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4785. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Depart-

ment's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 4936. A bill to provide assistance to small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Small Business, Education and the Workforce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 4937. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize pipeline safety programs and enhance pipeline safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr.

BUTTERFIELD, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. FOXX, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. COLE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HIMES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. LATTI, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 4938. A bill to make permanent the Internal Revenue Service Free File program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 4939. A bill to increase engagement with the governments of the Caribbean region, the Caribbean diaspora community in the United States, and the private sector and civil society in both the United States and the Caribbean, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4940. A bill to direct the Director of National Intelligence to establish an integration cell to monitor and enforce the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JONES, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 4941. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility for monthly stipends paid under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for certain members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 4942. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the standard charitable mileage rate for delivery of meals to elderly, disabled, frail and at risk individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 4943. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat Indian tribal governments in the same manner as State governments for certain Federal tax purposes, 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. NOLAN:

H.R. 4944. A bill to modify the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 4945. A bill to permanently secure the United States as the preeminent spacefaring nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Rules, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and 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. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. HARDY):

H.R. 4946. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an increase in the earned income tax credit for individuals with no qualifying children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 4947. A bill to establish a program to provide reinsurance for State natural catastrophe insurance programs to help the United States better prepare for and protect its citizens against the ravages of natural catastrophes, to encourage and promote mitigation and prevention for, and recovery and rebuilding from such catastrophes, and to better assist in the financial recovery from such catastrophes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 4948. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 4949. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion

from gross income for AmeriCorps educational awards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself and Mr. PITTINGER):

H.R. 4950. A bill to establish advisory committees within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 4951. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to allow the importation of certain foreign-manufactured firearms components; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 4952. A bill to impose a deadline by which a person whose Federal firearms license has expired, or is surrendered, or revoked, must liquidate the firearms inventory of any business subject to the license, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4953. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the length of administrative leave for Federal employees to 30 days, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.J. Res. 86. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for balanced budgets for the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VELA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 680. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Health Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H. Res. 681. A resolution honoring women who have served, and who are currently serving, as members of the Armed Forces and recognizing the recently expanded service opportunities available to female members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H. Res. 682. A resolution urging the Department of State to provide necessary equipment and training to the men and women of the Kurdish Peshmerga in the fight against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Res. 683. A resolution supporting and protecting the right of women working in developing countries to safe workplaces, free from gender-based violence, reprisals, and intimidation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 4936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to regulate commerce among the several states and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 4937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 4938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, which states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes," and Article I, Section 7, which states "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 4939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 4941.

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 IV, section 3 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 2 (empowering Congress to make rules and regulations respecting property belonging to the people of the United States), 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). Furthermore, this bill amends the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331), which Congress previously enacted pursuant to similar authority.

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 4942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

Section 1: ALL Legislative powers review granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate & House of Representatives.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 4943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1

"All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives"

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 4944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 4945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the common Defence."

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 4946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 4947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 4948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 4949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 4950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate commerce; as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 4951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 4952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 4953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.J. Res. 86.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 247: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 257: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 292: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 329: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 379: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 430: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 449: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 532: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 556: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 663: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 664: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 670: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 711: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 748: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 775: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 800: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 842: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 940: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 953: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 969: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 996: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1061: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1111: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1149: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1151: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 1174: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1206: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1218: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1247: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1256: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1258: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1288: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1301: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 1336: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1439: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1459: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1486: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1492: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1538: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1586: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1594: Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1603: Mr. MEEHAN and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1706: Mr. WELCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1728: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 1733: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1769: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1775: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1779: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1859: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1933: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1943: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 2114: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2132: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2205: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 2221: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2304: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 2342: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 2434: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2449: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 2493: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2519: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2536: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2658: Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. REED, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 2694: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2698: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2711: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2726: Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2775: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2799: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2817: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2848: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2850: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2896: Mr. FORBES and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2903: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2911: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 2939: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2948: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3007: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 3026: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 3099: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3119: Mr. RUSH and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3142: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3222: Mr. SALMON, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 3280: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 3308: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3326: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3384: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3406: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 3441: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 3463: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 3539: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 3576: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 3656: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3666: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3688: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 3706: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 3722: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 3808: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 3851: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 3862: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3870: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 3886: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 3892: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 3949: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3989: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 4055: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 4158: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 4160: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 4177: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 4184: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 4194: Ms. NORTON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4223: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 4247: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 4296: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 4320: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4399: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 4442: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROKITA, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 4447: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4454: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 4479: Mr. WELCH and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4480: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 4490: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 4498: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 4499: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 4511: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4515: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 4519: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 4523: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4534: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 4553: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 4554: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 4592: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4603: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 4611: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 4613: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 4625: Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 4626: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 4637: Mr. PALMER.
 H.R. 4640: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 4653: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4662: Mr. SCALISE.
 H.R. 4668: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 4681: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Ms. EDWARDS.
 H.R. 4693: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 4696: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H.R. 4710: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 4715: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 4730: Mr. BARR, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
 H.R. 4739: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 4754: Mr. LEWIS.
 H.R. 4764: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. RUSSELL.
 H.R. 4766: Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 4773: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SALMON, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 4786: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 4791: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4814: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 4816: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
 H.R. 4817: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 4819: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 4848: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. HARRIS.
 H.R. 4856: Mr. COOK and Mr. BUCK.
 H.R. 4864: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 4869: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H.R. 4890: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 4898: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 4901: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 4904: Mr. PALMER.
 H.R. 4905: Mr. HONDA and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 4907: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 4912: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 4924: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. ROBY, and Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 4926: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. JONES.
 H. J. Res. 11: Mrs. BLACK.
 H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. CALVERT.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. SALMON.

H. Con. Res. 112: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. TAKAI.
 H. Res. 14: Mr. PERRY.
 H. Res. 28: Mr. VEASEY.
 H. Res. 110: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 112: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H. Res. 192: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H. Res. 290: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H. Res. 394: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 487: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H. Res. 617: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H. Res. 642: Mr. AMODEI.
 H. Res. 661: Mr. GRAYSON and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H. Res. 665: Mr. POSEY, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SANFORD, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. YOHO.
 H. Res. 667: Mr. MESSER.
 H. Res. 668: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. CULBERSON.
 H. Res. 674: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. VIS-CLOSKY.
 H. Res. 675: Ms. BASS, Mr. BEYER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KATKO, and Ms. PLASKETT.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 2016

No. 57

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.

Almighty and eternal God, You are hidden from our sight, but we feel Your presence. Incline our spirits to seek You, our minds to know You, and our hearts to love You. Forgive us when we fail to hunger and thirst for righteousness.

Bless our lawmakers. Join them in heart, mind, and soul to do their best for the common good. Keep them so dedicated to Your purposes that they will do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with You.

Lord, into Your hands we commit our Nation and world.

We pray in Your marvelous 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.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 96, H.R. 2028.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 96, H.R. 2028, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion 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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 96, H.R. 2028, an act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Thad Cochran, Bill Cassidy, Roy Blunt, Mark Kirk, Thom Tillis, James Lankford, Cory Gardner, Orrin G. Hatch, John Thune, Johnny Isakson, Lisa Murkowski, James M. Inhofe, Susan M. Collins, Lamar Alexander, Shelley Moore Capito, Mitch McConnell.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate is closer to passing the most comprehensive aviation security reforms in years, and I hope we will do so today. This important legislation will bolster security for travelers and look out for consumers' interests.

Here is how it will help improve security: by improving vetting and inspections of airport employees to deter terrorist attacks; by expanding security measures and prescreening zones, which are often vulnerable; by shoring

up security for international flights coming into our airports; and by improving preparation for everything from cyber security attacks to active shooter scenarios to outbreaks of communicable diseases.

This legislation will also benefit consumers by requiring airlines to offer refunds for lost or delayed bags, by providing more information on things like seat availability, and by improving travel for passengers with disabilities. It accomplishes this without increasing taxes or fees on passengers and without imposing heavyhanded regulations that diminish choice for travelers.

This important FAA reauthorization and airport security legislation is the result of strong leadership by Senator THUNE, the chair of the Commerce Committee, and Senator AYOTTE, the chair of the Aviation Subcommittee, as well as their Democratic counterparts, Senators NELSON and CANTWELL. They worked diligently across party lines, listened to their colleagues' ideas, and never stopped working for legislation both sides could support.

In the Commerce Committee, nearly 60 amendments were accepted from both sides, and the bill passed by voice vote. On the floor, more than a dozen amendments were accepted from both sides, and I am optimistic that we will soon pass it here on a bipartisan basis. I appreciate the efforts of the bill managers to work through amendments and move the bill forward.

This important FAA reauthorization and airport security legislation was bipartisan from the start. It shows why returning to regular order is so important. It is another example of what can be achieved in this Republican-led Senate—a Senate we put back to work for the American people.

ENERGY POLICY MODERNIZATION BILL

Mr. President, thanks to an agreement reached last night, the Senate is now poised to pass broad, bipartisan energy legislation too. We have an agreement to take the Energy Policy

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2067

Modernization Act back up, consider even more amendments, and then take a final vote on it.

I was encouraged to see the Democratic leader yesterday agreeing that this is important legislation. It will support more American jobs, more American growth, and more American energy independence, and we will finish our work soon.

Passage of this bill will represent the culmination of more than a year's worth of hard work, countless listening sessions and oversight hearings, numerous amendment votes and debate hours, and impressive reserves of determination from both the chair, Senator MURKOWSKI, and the ranking member, Senator CANTWELL.

Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL never gave up. Even when passage of this bill seemed impossible, they never stopped pushing for it. I have been impressed by their efforts just as I have been impressed with what this broad bipartisan energy bill can achieve for our country.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

ENERGY AND FAA BILLS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I agree with the Republican leader that the energy bill is a good bill. As I said yesterday, it is just 3 years behind time. We have tried many times to move forward on it, but filibusters took place by the Republicans, and we were unable to get it done.

He is right that Senator CANTWELL and Senator MURKOWSKI never gave up and they worked through lots of problems. I wish we could have taken care of Flint in the process. That held things up for a little while but not long, and we are still looking at ways to take care of the people of Flint who have been really damaged by bad government.

So we are glad that Flint will come up in the near future, and we think we have ways of getting that done. Maybe we will see it in the appropriations bills that we are doing.

Energy is good, and I am glad we got it done. Now, we have allowed this to move forward. We have not been blocking the bill. We agreed, even though the bill is long overdue, and we are not going to treat people the way we were treated. So we are glad that is done.

On the FAA bill, I am glad we are going to get something done. As we know, we missed an opportunity to take care of a lot of people who are desperate for help. People in the State of Nevada—geothermal—they need help. Fuel cells, biomass, and other energy initiatives were left out. By inadvertence in the drafting of the bill, they were left out. The Republican leader said he will take care of that, and I am confident that he will. It is a longer wait for people, and it makes it difficult for people to hang on to their businesses. I know that his job is hard. He has told me and he has told Leader PELOSI that he will get this done this

year. So we are looking forward to that.

PASSING A BUDGET RESOLUTION AND FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. President, tomorrow is April 15. Under the Congressional Budget Act, that is the day by which Congress is supposed to have completed a budget resolution.

This Republican Congress will not meet tomorrow's deadline. We have known that for some time. By all indications, they have no intention of doing anything to pass a budget resolution any time soon.

As the Republican leader told reporters earlier this week, in the absence of a budget resolution, Republicans will simply use the top-line spending numbers that we agreed upon last year. Here is what he said:

We're waiting to see if the House is able to do a budget. In the meantime I've already announced, and I'll announce again today that we're going to move to appropriations next week, probably starting with energy and water, and we'll mark these bills to the top line that we agreed to in the agreement last year.

As we know, just a minute ago, he filed cloture on the energy and water bill.

If this statement he made sounds familiar, it should, because that is what we did when we were in the majority. We used the top line numbers in the Murray-Ryan budget agreement as a basis for spending bills. Republicans will begin that same process today as the appropriations process gets under way with the first full committee markup of the year.

But how did Republicans react when we did the same thing? They were falling all over themselves—speech after speech—to criticize us. They had charts and graphs and anything to focus on there being no budget. They came out endlessly to taunt us with over-the-top rhetoric. They shed crocodile tears by the bucket. They even threatened to withhold Members' pay as punishment. There was legislation produced to that effect, but it was all for show.

Republicans promised voters that, once in power, they would pass a budget each and every year. That is what the Republican leader promised in 2012, saying:

I don't think the law says, "Pass a budget unless it's hard," so I think there's no question that we would take up our responsibility. . . . We will be passing a budget. . . . Every year.

That was the Republican pledge: Give us the majority, and we will pass a budget every year.

Well, it is pretty clear that they are going to break that promise.

This is just the latest example of the Republicans refusing to meet their commitments—refusing to do their jobs—even according to their own terms.

It is just like the refusal to consider Supreme Court nominee Merrick Garland. We have years and years' worth

of statements from the Republican leader and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee in which they said unequivocally that it is the Senate's duty to consider the President's Supreme Court nominees. I have read their quotes on this floor endlessly.

These statements go back decades. The Republican leader wrote papers in law school demanding the Senate give Supreme Court nominees all due consideration. Well, all due consideration is not refusing to meet with a man, not holding hearings, and not allowing a vote.

But now that he, the Republican leader, is in a position to do something about that article he wrote in law school and the other statements that have been made by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he won't give Merrick Garland a hearing or a vote. He won't even meet with him, even though the chairman of the Judiciary Committee met with him in secret, not in his office but in the private dining room downstairs, and then went out the back door, described as stumbling over chairs to vacate the premises.

So, basically, what I ask is this: Where are all the Republican Senators who came to the floor to bash Democrats for the lack of a budget resolution? They have gone silent. I am just asking: When are the Republicans going to do their job?

Mr. President, I see no one on the floor wishing to speak, so I ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 636, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 636) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Thune/Nelson) amendment No. 3679, in the nature of a substitute.

Thune amendment No. 3680 (to amendment No. 3679), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The senior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to end debate so the Senate can vote and pass the pro-security and pro-consumer provisions within the bipartisan Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 2016.

For the past 2 weeks on the Senate floor and earlier at the Commerce Committee, we have engaged in a constructive and open process to consider amendments making important changes to this legislation that sets

aviation policies for our country. On the Senate floor we added 19 amendments, 10 from Democrats and 9 from Republican Senators, and at the Commerce Committee we approved 57 amendments, 34 from Democrats and 23 from Republicans. A number of these amendments were substantial, including the vast majority of the aviation security provisions within the legislation.

We have also agreed to set aside discussions on certain issues for now so we could continue to have a bill with broad bipartisan support. On some policy issues where there was disagreement, we found the will of the Senate through negotiation and votes. Our debate has been constructive, and I value the process by which we have allowed Senators to make their mark on this bill.

After 2 weeks of consideration, it is now time to conclude our work on the bipartisan legislation I introduced along with my friend, the ranking member from Florida, Senator BILL NELSON, and our Aviation Subcommittee leaders, KELLY AYOTTE and MARIA CANTWELL.

The bill we can vote on today has been described in the Washington Post as “one of the most passenger-friendly Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization bills in a generation.”

Even more important, this bill includes strong, new security measures that address the threat that ISIS and other terrorist groups pose to airline passengers. It is a comprehensive bill addressing needs in cyber security, the aircraft design approval process, undue regulatory burdens on noncommercial pilots, airport infrastructure, rural air service, lithium battery safety, mental health screening for pilots, communicable disease preparedness, drone safety, and many other important issues. This bill helps the public that relies on our air transportation system, and we shouldn't let them down.

A vote yes on the motion to end debate allows us to move forward and to get these reforms going forward by agreeing to ultimately vote on them and to vote on passage of this bill.

Again, I thank all who are involved. Senator NELSON and I started this process months ago. I think we had somewhere on the order of seven hearings, full committee and subcommittee, in debating and helping shape the bill. It was a very constructive process as we went through the markup, where we incorporated the suggestions and good ideas that came from many Members of our committee. We tried to continue that process on the floor of the Senate, and we have been successful in adding some amendments that strengthen the bill. I wish we could add more. I hope we can still reach agreement. There are still negotiations underway for another package of 25 or 30 amendments that we would like to get added to this bill if we can get the level of cooperation that is necessary to accomplish that.

In the end, we need to pass this. It is important for the American people. It is a piece of legislation that needs to get voted on in the Senate, hopefully on to the House, and eventually on the President's desk.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota. He has been a real friend and a champion in being able to work together in the best traditions of the Senate in trying to craft—and I think we have successfully—a bipartisan piece of legislation that continues, as the Senator has quoted from one of the papers, to advance the FAA in a way that we should be sensitive to the needs of the flying public.

It is also this Senator's hope that where we have disagreements on just a few amendments, that after we have a big vote invoking cloture so we can move on with the bill, that a package of 30-some amendments—noncontroversial, bipartisan—would then be allowed to be adopted by unanimous consent, and then it is possible that we could move on to the final passage early this afternoon. That is this Senator's hope.

Let me underscore what the Senator has already said. There are a lot of challenges in how we conduct ourselves in the airspace of this country. There are a lot of important things that we have to do, such as modernizing the air traffic control system, the next generation of technology in moving us efficiently, and in the process it has to be safe.

Therefore, as we see new kinds of challenges because of technology—for example, unmanned aerial vehicles, drones—we have to approach that with great caution and make sure we know what we are doing so the flying public is safe.

I hope we get a big vote on this motion for cloture.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 3679.

Mitch McConnell, Daniel Coats, Roger F. Wicker, Roy Blunt, Orrin G. Hatch, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, James Lankford, John Thune, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, James M. Inhofe, Jerry Moran, Kelly Ayotte.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 3679, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. McCONNELL, to H.R. 636, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 45 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Ayotte	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Reed
Blunt	Hatch	Reid
Booker	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Heitkamp	Roberts
Brown	Heller	Rounds
Burr	Hirono	Sasse
Cantwell	Hoeven	Schatz
Capito	Inhofe	Schumer
Cardin	Isakson	Scott
Carper	Johnson	Sessions
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Cassidy	King	Shelby
Coats	Kirk	Stabenow
Cochran	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Collins	Lankford	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Manchin	Tillis
Cornyn	Markey	Toomey
Cotton	McCain	Udall
Crapo	McCaskill	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Enzi	Mikulski	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden
Feinstein	Murkowski	
Fischer	Murphy	

NAYS—4

Boxer	Portman
Lee	Rubio

NOT VOTING—2

Cruz	Sanders
------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94, the nays are 4.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 627

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, America was horrified 2 years ago as the scandal at the VA unfolded. We heard about veterans dying while they were waiting for care. Meanwhile, we discovered that VA employees manipulated appointment wait lists to hide the fact that the VA couldn't provide the care our veterans needed in a timely fashion.

The denial of earned care is always tragic, but it is inexcusable when the denial is driven by bureaucratic tampering and falsifications. Cooking the books was one bureaucratic offense, but not holding accountable those responsible is an additional bureaucratic failure, and one that continues to haunt our system.

These weren't just a few scattered incidents either. The VA inspector general investigated 73 VA facilities across

the country and found problems in 51 of them, ranging from rule violations to outright fraud. These reports demonstrate that inappropriate scheduling practices were systematic at the VA.

This map shows how widespread the wait-list rule violations and manipulations have been. The inspector general's office found out how our veterans were treated when they called up looking for care. The information the VA gave was manipulated to make it seem as though the VA was doing much better than it was. We literally know that veterans died while waiting for care. That is shameful, and we owe it to those who served this Nation to serve them. They earned this by defending us and our freedoms.

Unfortunately, one of those 51 cases was the VA medical center in my home State of New Hampshire.

A New Hampshire newspaper summarizes the inspector general's report as follows:

Staff at the Manchester VA Medical Center manipulated appointment dates and refused to schedule referrals beyond 14 days in some speciality departments, all to make it appear patients were being seen quickly.

One report also shows that top officials at the Manchester VA discouraged the use of electronic waiting lists.

Another shows extremely long waits at the facility's Pain Clinic, where one patient waited an average of seven to eight months for injection treatments.

The reports show a near obsession with keeping numbers down when it comes to the length of time that veterans had to wait for appointments, which is one of the ways bonuses for hospital officials were determined.

Bonuses were determined by how you performed on the scheduling and whether you were actually meeting the needs of our veterans on time. Yet we know they were manipulating wait lists across the country to show that they were, in fact, serving our veterans when they were not.

Last week I met with the current Manchester VA medical center director to discuss the findings of the inspector general's report. Even though it didn't occur under her leadership, these findings are serious and must be dealt with appropriately. While I was encouraged to hear of the steps the director has taken to address the scheduling misconduct, I will be closely following the medical center's practices and performance.

We cannot let this happen again. Part of not letting it happen again is what brings me to the floor today. I will make sure we aren't incentivizing misconduct and allowing wrongdoers to get away with it, whether it is the wait-list manipulations or misconduct.

Unfortunately, the wait-list scandal isn't the only scandal at the VA. There is a common theme with all these scandals: Those committing misconduct are getting bonuses—yes, bonuses. Those involved in wrongdoing are getting checks paid by the American taxpayer. That is unacceptable, and that is why I introduced bipartisan legislation to improve accountability at the Depart-

ment of Veterans Affairs by requiring the VA Secretary to claw back bonuses paid to VA employees who were involved in serious misconduct or felonies. It would also require the VA to retain a copy of any reprimand or admonishment given to an employee by the Department which would then be in that employee's permanent record. Keeping that information in someone's employment record seems like common sense, but we have to pass this bill in order to do that. Amazingly, the Secretary of the VA doesn't currently have the authority to claw back bonuses even if, as with the wait list, the perpetrator's misconduct led to a bigger bonus check. That is unacceptable. We cannot reward those who commit fraud and misconduct by doling out taxpayer dollars.

A recent report noted that in 2014 the VA paid out \$140 million in bonuses. Nearly half of the VA's employees got bonuses. More importantly, we know that individuals who were implicated in an array of scandals also received bonuses. For example, the director of the Phoenix VA hospital who was fired for her misconduct got a \$9,000 bonus. The VA senior managers who improperly leveraged their positions to get hundreds of thousands of dollars in relocation funds to move to new facilities, along with a bump in pay—even though they were committing misrepresentations and fraud—got bonuses. A VA employee who recently pleaded the Fifth Amendment before a congressional committee got a bonus. Executives overseeing the \$1 billion-over-budget VA medical center construction project in Colorado got bonuses. A doctor implicated in overprescribing opioids at the Tomah VA facility called "Candy Land," where veterans were harmed—bonus.

We can't let these bonuses keep going to wrongdoers. It will just continue the erosion of trust of our veterans, who have done so much to defend this Nation and our freedom. That is why we need to pass this bill. The VA Secretary must be active in pursuing the disciplinary actions against VA employees guilty of misconduct so they aren't getting bonuses and taking away resources that could go to help our veterans. Without my legislation, the VA Secretary does not have the authority right now to go after a bonus, even if the bonus is given to a wrongdoer, to claw that money back.

This bill passed out of committee by a voice vote. The records retention provisions in this bill passed out of the House of Representatives by voice vote. Let's put this authority into law so that those who break the law don't get bonuses. That is why I am standing on the floor today asking for unanimous consent to pass this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 240, S. 627. I further ask that the Ayotte and Brown amendments be agreed to; the committee-reported sub-

stitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; the title amendment be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I agree with much of what the Senator from New Hampshire said, and that is that our veterans deserve to have the highest quality care by the Veterans Administration. Those employees at the Veterans Administration who have not carried out their responsibility should be disciplined, and when there are adverse findings, there should be consequences to them. So I agree with much of what she has said.

However, let us be mindful that the overwhelming number of Federal workers, including those at the Veterans Administration, are hard-working public servants, asked to do more with less resources. They have been through freezes, furloughs, government shutdowns, sequestration—you name it.

I understand that the Veterans' Affairs Committee is considering more comprehensive legislation, as they should. As my colleague from New Hampshire has mentioned, this deals with one aspect of those who have adverse findings in regard to their ability to get bonuses or the reprimand on their record.

Here is my problem. If we use a unanimous consent request, there is no opportunity for amendment, and there is no opportunity for debate. When I finish my comments, I am going to ask that the Senator amend her unanimous consent request to include an amendment that I wish to offer. Let me explain what it does.

Yes, we want to hold the employee accountable—those who have not carried out the public trust in which there are adverse findings. But there also has to be accountability for the supervisors, for those who should be managing the agency so that we don't have employees doing what they did.

Managers need to have tools. They need to be able to manage their employees. They need to be able to determine how their employees are handled if we are going to hold them accountable, and I want to hold the supervisors accountable. So my amendment would allow the supervisor to determine the length of the suspension of the bonus that the individual could receive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If I could just ask Members to take their conversations out of the Senate Chamber.

Mr. CARDIN. I appreciate that, and I thank the Presiding Officer very much. I thought I was getting an agreement here.

So to continue, it could be longer than the 5 years that is in the bill of the Senator from New Hampshire, but it would be the manager or supervisor who would determine the length of the suspension of the right to receive the

bonus, so that the manager has the tools in order to manage the workforce and we can hold the supervisor accountable.

The second amendment is similar, as it relates to the reprimand being retained in the records. It allows the manager to have the discretion as to the length of time.

The bill that the Senator from New Hampshire is recommending is a hard 5-year period, and it doesn't give the manager the ability to use these tools as ways to advance service to our veterans.

The bottom line here is service to our veterans. That is the bottom line—that they get the services they deserve.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify her request so that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 240, S. 627; that in lieu of the committee-reported substitute and title amendments, that the Cardin substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; that the Cardin title amendment be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

That would carry out the modifications that I said, giving the manager the ability to impose either a shorter or longer period of time than the bill of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire so modify her request?

Ms. AYOTTE. No, I do not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. CARDIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator from Maryland. I agree, and I believe there are many hard-working Federal employees. The reason that I have been fighting for this bill in particular is, No. 1, to make sure that those who commit misconduct are held accountable. No. 2, I actually want to make sure that we aren't sending the wrong message to the people who are working hard and doing their jobs. When they see someone else who has committed misconduct by literally manipulating wait lists get a bonus, that actually demoralizes the good, hard-working employees who are doing their jobs and serving veterans.

So this is about making sure that the people who actually do a good job get recognized. But when you give a bonus to someone who has committed misconduct, you not only obviously undermine our system—thinking about the veterans who have served our Nation with so much courage and done so much for us—not only do we corrode their trust, but I think we corrode the trust of the workforce that is doing really great work every day, and I want to thank those who are doing the

good work on our behalf. I have had a chance to meet many of them.

I want to address the point of the Senator from Maryland about giving managers authority. I wish to point out that the problem we have here is that this is rampant—absolutely rampant. If we look at what happened with the director of the Phoenix VA who lost her job—fired for misconduct—where literally wait lists were manipulated and veterans died, she got a \$9,000 bonus. So who are we going to leave discretion to here? Many of the managers, I know, need to manage the facilities, which is important. But when it comes to the bonus issue, we literally would be putting, for example in the Phoenix situation, the individual who gets fired for overseeing all of this in charge of whether and how long other people's bonuses are clawed back. I would also say that this has been rampant, unfortunately, about management, and not just of the director of the Phoenix VA but the other examples I gave, including the VA senior managers who improperly leveraged their positions to get hundreds of thousands of dollars in relocation funds. So, in other words, they were misappropriating taxpayer dollars. They got bonuses too. They are managers.

We have executives overseeing the huge cost overrun in the Colorado VA who got bonuses. We have many examples. If we put this at the discretion of how long this is going to go in place instead of putting a logical time period in place, which my bill does, then we are going to keep perpetuating the same situation where the discretion makes it so it doesn't happen. That worries me, because, unfortunately, we have a pattern here that needs to be addressed.

Second, I would just say that, as we look at even the ability to retain records, most employers do have standard recordkeeping in terms of if you receive a reprimand or an admonishment and how long that is retained. So if we just leave that completely loosey-goosey discretion among managers, where we have already established some of them have been part of this misconduct, then I fear there really will be no accountability and these provisions will not have the teeth in them that they should.

Let me just say that this bill that we have been working on, that did pass out of committee, is something that I have been working on and negotiating for months, working and taking people's concerns into account. It does ensure that, before any employee is subject to having the bonus clawed back, they do have the opportunity for due process. So that is built into this to challenge the underlying claims made against them. But if we put this all into a discretionary basis, then we are just going to be in the same situation that we are right now and not have the teeth that we need in this commonsense measure.

I talked to some of my constituents about this issue, and they can't believe

that we actually have to pass a law to say that if you got a bonus and you committed misconduct—in fact, one of the reasons you got the bonus is because of the misconduct, because you manipulated the wait list—yes, you can give that money back, and you shouldn't be receiving a bonus. It is kind of shocking that this isn't just common sense. But right now the VA Secretary does not have this authority.

Our veterans deserve better. This is plain common sense. I am disappointed that the modification that was sought on the floor would weaken this commonsense bill. I am going to continue to fight for more accountability in our VA. But let's have some common sense in all of this. We shouldn't be rewarding our employees who are committing misconduct for the very conduct that they are committing and that unfortunately is harming our veterans who have done so much for this Nation.

I am the granddaughter of a World War II veteran. My husband is an Iraq veteran. I have had the privilege in my job of meeting so many of our veterans, both current Active-Duty military and those who have served in conflicts going back to World War II. There is no greater example of patriotism and what makes our country great than our veterans. Really, if we think about what has happened in our VA and how shameful it is, this is something that we need to make sure we get right once and for all for those who have defended this Nation and who really show us what it means to be an American.

So I am going to continue to fight for such a commonsense piece of legislation, but I hope my colleagues will join me in this so that we can make sure that the VA performs its mission, which is to give our veterans the best care they can receive and that they certainly have earned defending our great Nation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the hard work Senator AYOTTE has put into her bill and her willingness to work across the aisle with the ranking member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and Senator BROWN. Since I objected to her unanimous consent request and she objected to my counteroffer, I would like to take a few moments to outline my concerns about her bill and explain why I offered a complete substitute amendment that reflects those concerns and an amendment to change the title.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that I do not condone malfeasance by any Federal executive or employee. The well-documented problems at the Veterans Administration, VA, are particularly troubling because they harmed the men and women who have defended our Nation—and their families. That is unacceptable.

There is an old proverb, "You can fix the blame or you can fix the problem." Actually, VA Secretary Robert McDonald, his leadership team, and the VA rank-and-file are doing both.

To that end, I would encourage my colleagues to read the December 9, 2015, testimony of Sloan D. Gibson, Deputy Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In the context of patient access and scheduling data manipulation concerns that came to light at the Phoenix VA Medical Center, Deputy Secretary Gibson reported that, as of October 2015, VA completed 97 percent of appointments within 30 days of the clinically indicated or veteran's preferred date; 91 percent within 14 days; 87 percent within 7 days; and 24 percent on the same day. VA's average wait time for completed primary care appointments is 4 days; specialty care is 5 days; and mental health care is 3 days.

The Veterans Benefits Administration, VBA, completed 1.4 million claims in fiscal year 2015, nearly 67,000 more than the previous year and the highest completion rate in VA history. Fiscal year 2015 marked the 6th year in a row of more than 1 million claims.

VBA reduced its claims backlog 88 percent from a peak of 610,000 in March 2013 to a historic low of 75,122 and reduced inventory 58 percent from a peak of 884,000 in July 2012 to 369,328, 28 percent lower than fiscal year 2014.

The average number of days a veteran is waiting for a claims decision, pending, is 91 days, a 191-day reduction from a peak of 282 days in March 2013 and the lowest average number of days pending in the 21st century. VBA's average days to complete is now 129 days—a 60-day reduction from fiscal year 2014. So VA is improving its services to veterans. That is fixing the problem.

Now, what about VA supervisors and employees who engaged in misbehavior or wrongdoing? There is a popular misconception that you can't get rid of Federal workers. In fact, in fiscal year 2015, 2,348 VA employees were removed, terminated during probation, or retired or resigned with a removal action pending. Over 1,800 of these individuals—or more than 75 percent—were fired. To be clear, these numbers pertain to the entire Department for all infractions and are not limited to the wait list problem.

It is a mistake just to focus on those numbers. As Secretary McDonald and Deputy Secretary Gibson wrote in the January 21, 2016, Wall Street Journal, "You can't fire your way to excellence." But the point here is that punishments have been and are being meted out; people have had their careers ended. That is fixing the blame.

I will briefly outline my concerns with S. 627, even as reported and as it would be modified by the Ayotte and Brown amendments.

First, the bill deprives the Secretary of the discretionary authority needed to manage and discipline the VA workforce appropriately.

Second, the bill establishes new precedents for punishing Federal workers that haven't been thoroughly vet-

ted and may have harmful unintended consequences.

Third the bill has two major components. The first deals with bonuses; the second deals with employees' personnel records and reprimands and admonishments. The second component was added at mark-up and was not a subject considered when the Veterans Affairs Committee held its hearing on bonuses on May 13, 2015. The Republican leader talks about the need to restore regular order. There ought to be a hearing regarding the second component. And fairness dictates that a witness from a Federal employee union, such as the American Federation of Government Employees, which represents many VA workers, should be invited to testify.

As Senators BLUMENTHAL, MURRAY, SANDERS, BROWN, TESTER, and HIRONO stated in their Minority Views in Senate Report 114-148:

Besides the substantive issues with the provision that we have identified, section 2 of S. 627 was derived from S. 1496, a bill that has not been considered in a legislative hearing. For a significant and controversial provision like section 2 of S. 627, the Committee should have held a legislative hearing to give all Members the opportunity to hear from witnesses and fully understand the consequences of this provision.

I am not objecting simply to object. I would like to work with the junior Senator from New Hampshire to see if we can find common ground, and that is why I sent a substitute amendment and title change amendment, which needs to be done separately, to the desk, and asked her to modify her consent request to reflect these two amendments.

Let me explain exactly what I am proposing. The unanimous consent that has been hot-lined consists of three elements. The first is S. 627 as reported. The second is an Ayotte amendment modifying provisions of that bill dealing with bonuses. The third is a Brown amendment modifying provisions of that bill dealing with reprimands and admonishments.

What I have done is to combine all three elements into a single substitute and modify it to restore to the Secretary some managerial discretion, which I feel is essential for someone charged with running a department the size of a Fortune Six company.

As reported, the title of the bill is "To require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes".

While the wait list problem may have spawned this bill, that title is inaccurate. The bill has no such limitations implied by that title; it applies Department-wide for any offense.

So I propose a simple amendment changing the title to read: "To amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup inappropriate bonuses paid to or on behalf of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes."

Section 1 of S. 627 as reported and as further modified by the Ayotte amendment prohibits the Secretary from awarding bonuses for 5 years to any employee who is the subject of an "adverse finding." My substitute amendment changes that provision to give the Secretary discretion to withhold future bonuses "until such date as the Secretary considers appropriate."

Now, my language theoretically empowers the Secretary to withhold bonuses for more than 5 years. The point here is to provide the Secretary with the flexibility needed to manage, discipline, and incentivize 340,000 people in an appropriate fashion. I wonder if there is any Senator who has managed a workforce as large as the VA's and, if so, would have preferred surrendering his or her discretion to make personnel decisions as he or she thought necessary.

Section 1 of S. 627 as reported and further modified by the Ayotte amendment of the bill states in part that:

The Secretary may base an adverse finding . . . on an investigation by, determination of, or information provided by the Inspector General of the Department or another senior ethics official of the Department or the Comptroller General of the United States . . .

I believe the Secretary must base an adverse finding on an independent determination. As I have stated, I fully support increasing accountability at the VA—and that includes making sure that a VA employee does not receive a bonus while engaging in misconduct.

Senator AYOTTE's bill, however, does not require the Secretary to base an adverse finding on the determination of an independent decisionmaker. My amendment would cure this defect and set appropriate limits by requiring the Secretary to base an adverse finding on an independent determination. By doing so, it would ensure that bonus bans are not arbitrary.

Section 1 of S. 627 as reported and further modified by the Ayotte amendment requires the Secretary to recoup bonuses paid to employees if they are subsequently subject to an adverse finding with respect to the years during which the bonuses were awarded.

Furthermore, section 1 requires VA employees to certify that they will repay any bonus received during a year in which an adverse finding may subsequently be made.

These provisions raise many unanswered questions, including how such actions would be treated with respect to determining Federal and State tax liabilities. But I have left these provisions unchanged.

Section 1 of S. 627 as reported and further modified by the Ayotte amendment states that "The Secretary may promulgate such rules as the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out this section."

Considering the unprecedented nature of the sanctions in section 1, I believe it is imperative that the Secretary engage in a formal rulemaking

to allow all interested parties the opportunity to weigh in with their concerns and suggestions.

S. 627 is characterized as a legislative response to a specific management crisis at the VA. Yet it sets several new precedents and penalties that will be applied in a much broader context. As such, I believe it would be appropriate to sunset the bill after 3 years to encourage Congress to revisit whether it is an appropriate legislative remedy to the “wait list” problem at the VA and whether the bill is causing any adverse unintended consequences.

My original proposal to the junior Senator from New Hampshire included two sunset provisions, for section 1 and for section 2, which I will discuss momentarily. Senator AYOTTE objected to the sunset provisions, so I have removed them from my substitute amendment at the desk.

Section 2 of S. 627 as reported and further modified by the Brown amendment requires the Secretary to retain reprimands and/or admonishments in the personnel records of affected employees for a minimum of 5 years. While this is a significant improvement over the original provision, which was to retain such actions permanently, it is still problematic.

First, as I mentioned previously, this provision was added after the Veterans Affairs Committee conducted its hearing and, consequently, hasn’t been sufficiently considered.

Furthermore, Active-Duty personnel can request that reprimands be removed from their military personnel records jackets, MPRJs, at any time, and reprimands can only remain in the MPRJ for a maximum of 3 years.

One in three VA employees is a veteran. Should someone have fewer rights to clear his or her personnel record as a civilian than he or she had while serving on Active Duty?

Section 2 of the bill is unlikely to increase accountability at the VA. However well intentioned the provision may be, it is much more likely to cause significant increases in taxpayer-funded litigation costs because the VA will no longer be able to resolve routine personnel disputes through Clear Record Settlement Agreements, CRAs. The Merit Systems Protection Board, MSPB, reported in 2013 that 95 percent of agency representatives resolved disputes using Negotiated Settlement Agreements, NSAs, and 89 percent of these agreements involved CRAs.

Quoting again from the Minority Views I referred to previously:

In testimony before the House Committee of Veterans’ Affairs, VA noted that it is the standard practice across the Federal government, including the Department of Defense, for letters of reprimand and/or admonishment to be retained on a time-limited basis. According to VA, making letters of reprimand or admonishment permanent would prevent VA managers from “settling workplace grievances with employees with terms that would limit the amount of time these documents remain in the employee’s permanent record,” and it would restrict VA man-

agers from removing these documents as a “term of settlement.” Both of these tools are frequently used by VA managers to “resolve complaints before they go into costly and high-risk” litigation. These tools also allow VA managers to promote good performance of employees “because they are usually conditioned upon no further misconduct of the type that initially led to the reprimand or admonishment.”

Given all of these problems with section 2, even as it has been significantly improved by the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Ohio, I come back to the basic proposition that the Secretary must have sufficient discretion when it comes to managing the VA workforce. My amendment gives the Secretary that discretion by allowing, not mandating, that reprimands and/or admonishments may be retained for 5 years. Note that this still represents a significant departure from current practices government-wide. And, as I mentioned a moment ago, I originally proposed sunseting section 2 after 3 years, but I removed that provision from the current version of the substitute amendment.

I sincerely believe these changes are reasonable and improve S. 627, and I hope the junior Senator from New Hampshire will ultimately agree.

To reiterate, no one condones what happened at the VA. But it is important to acknowledge that accountability is being restored and the miscreants are being punished.

As Secretary McDonald and Deputy Secretary Gibson wrote in the Wall Street Journal:

You can’t fire your way to excellence. You have to inspire the people you keep to do better, and you have to recruit and inspire new talent. You can’t do either by capriciously punishing people on the basis of unsubstantiated rumors, complaints or media reports . . . Neither we nor anyone else can accomplish the VA’s mission of caring for veterans by depriving VA employees of basic fairness. To do right by veterans, we must do right by VA employees. We will do right by both, whatever the consequences.

I am privileged to represent 130,000 civilian federal workers, including members of the Senior Executive Service, SES; other senior managers; and rank-and-file employees who work in Maryland. Tens of thousands more live in Maryland or live and work in Maryland. Nearly 20 percent of these individuals have already served our Nation in uniform. Overwhelmingly, these individuals are hard-working, dedicated, and patriotic Americans who perform critical missions under difficult circumstances. In the last 5 years, civilian Federal workers have “contributed” \$182 billion to deficit reduction. They have endured a 3-year pay freeze. They lost \$1 billion in pay due to furloughs related to sequestration. They have been forced during government shutdowns to stay home against their will or to work without being paid on time. And they have been victimized by data breaches that have compromised their most sensitive personal information—some of which the Washington Post reported on January 31, 2016, has

literally been provided to the Islamic State terrorist group.

While we can and will disagree on the proper size and scope of the Federal Government, I would hope we can all agree that we want the “best and brightest” to perform critical missions such as providing our veterans with the care they have earned so valiantly. This is especially true with regard to the senior executives entrusted with managing large workforces and multi-billion dollar budgets.

Depriving or diminishing due process rights at the VA already has caused the number of applicants over the past 3 years for both title 5 SES positions and title 38 equivalent positions to decline significantly.

With respect to VA title 5 SES positions, in fiscal year 2013, there were 8,721 applicants. In fiscal year 2014, that number dropped to 6,908. In fiscal year 2015, it dropped even further to 6,317.

With respect to VA title 38 SES equivalent employees, in fiscal year 2013, there were 1,020 applicants. In fiscal year 2014, that number dropped to 432. In fiscal year 2015, it dropped even further to 228.

One might argue that these declines represent the “winnowing out” of unqualified or underqualified applicants.

I would argue it is just as likely, if not more so, that these declines represent the winnowing out of highly qualified applicants who could have helped to restore greater accountability and better service at the VA, but were discouraged from applying because the deck is being stacked against them.

We all want our veterans to receive the best care possible. So I reiterate my sincere desire to work with the junior Senator from New Hampshire. As I said at the outset of my remarks, I appreciate the hard work Senator AYOTTE has put into her bill and her willingness to work across the aisle with the ranking member of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and Senator BROWN.

Rather than simply leaving the matter here, I would note that the Department of Veterans Affairs has identified several Senate bills that provide the agency with the authority and tools it needs to address what the VA calls “breakthrough priorities” such as: improving the veterans’ experience; improving access to health care; improving community care; developing a simplified appeals process; and reducing homelessness among veterans.

As I understand it, there is an effort underway in the Veterans’ Affairs Committee to develop comprehensive legislation that helps the VA to meet these priorities while also addressing accountability and internal staffing issues. I think it makes sense to work on a comprehensive reform and accountability package bill rather than trying to pass individual bills in a piecemeal fashion, and I look forward to working with the junior Senator

from New Hampshire and every other Senator concerned about our veterans to accomplish this objective in the weeks and months ahead.

Ms. AYOTTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, just a little while ago there was an overwhelming vote to proceed with the FAA bill, the Federal Aviation Administration bill, a very important bill. I know how hard the managers have worked on it—the chairman, the ranking member—and I have a tremendous amount of respect for them. I voted no. Only four of us voted no. It is rare that I do that, and I felt it was important to explain why.

We have in our Nation an amazing system of transportation, and we always have to stay on top of it to make it safer and safer. There is one thing we know without a doubt. We know it intuitively, but we also know it because the National Transportation Safety Board has told us that the No. 1 problem they face in terms of safety is fatigue.

We all know how it is. All of us, regardless of what we do for a living, know how it feels when we are utterly exhausted. We are not making the same decisions we would make. We can't carry them out the way we otherwise would. It is not rocket science. It is sleep science. We know about it because the experts have told us, and the NTSB has told us.

I will show a picture of two planes. They look exactly alike. As our kids say, one of these things is not like the other. Here is a cargo plane and passenger jet. They are the same size. They fly over the same skies. They have pilots whom we trust, whom we count on.

Today, because of special interest pressure, there is a different set of rest rules. The passenger plane pilot can only fly up to 9 hours a day because—rightly so, with all of that responsibility—that pilot has to get rest. The cargo plane pilot flies the same exact plane. That pilot can be on duty up to 16 hours a day before he or she is guaranteed adequate rest.

I know the Presiding Officer has worked very hard in recent months, and I know the energy it took to go out and do what he did. I know what it was like when I was running for the Senate so many times—thank you, California—with almost 40 million people in the State, how hard it was, how much rest was needed to be sharp so we could think. In our work if we make a mistake, it only hurts us, but when a pilot makes a mistake, it can hurt a much larger community because the

cargo plane is flying over the same homes as the passenger jet. How does it make sense to say one can be on duty up to 16 hours and the other cannot, especially when the National Transportation Safety Board has said pilot fatigue is one of the biggest problems we are facing today.

Now one might ask: Can you prove that it is a problem? Yes, I am going to prove it to you. I am going to show a graphic of a conversation that took place between two cargo pilots, the pilot and copilot. This was 2013, and they were over Alabama. These are excerpts from the grave. This is dramatic. It isn't me trying to persuade the Presiding Officer. These are the pilots.

Pilot 1: I mean I don't get that. You know it should be one level of safety for everybody.

Pilot 2: It makes no sense at all.

Pilot 1: No it doesn't at all.

Pilot 2: And to be honest, it should be across the board. To be honest in my opinion whether you are flying passengers or cargo . . . if you're flying this time of day . . . the you know fatigue is definitely. . . .

Pilot 1: Yeah . . . yeah . . . yeah. . . .

Pilot 2: When my alarm went off I mean I'm thinkin', I'm so tired.

Pilot 2: I know.

Look what happened to that plane within hours of that conversation. Look what happened to that plane. This shows what happened, and the pilots are dead.

After the flight recorder was released and this conversation was out, I thought for sure this administration would do the right thing. They did the wrong thing, and the Senate did the wrong thing. This isn't partisan.

We have the Obama administration, which I agree with, and today I heard some amazing news on jobs. I am just saying on this they haven't been right. There ought to be no disparity between a pilot who is flying a passenger jet and a pilot who is flying a cargo jet. The pilots are telling us this. The pilots who are telling us this are not selfish. In fact, many of them are the pilots of passenger jets such as Southwest Airlines—8,000 of them. There are 8,000 of them supporting the Boxer-Klobuchar amendment.

I can't get a vote. That is why I voted no along with three other colleagues who had their reasons. This was my reason. How do we do a bill like this and not address the No. 1 safety issue facing us? I don't get it.

If you don't believe me, fair enough, because I am not a pilot. I admit it. I just trust pilots. What is your choice? You walk on a plane, the pilot is in charge of the aircraft, and you know that pilot wants to land safely. You know that pilot wants to go home to his or her family. You know that pilot has your best interests at heart. Sometimes I am in a rush, and I get on a plane and the pilot says: You know what. We are not going to take off right now because I know there is something wrong in one of the monitors here. It could be nothing, but I put safety first.

Everyone in the plane says: Oh, no. We are going to be late. They get out their cell phones and they call their loved ones, but we know the pilots know what they are talking about. We trust them. I trust them so much I wrote with then-Senator Smith the guns-in-the-cockpit law for pilots. The NRA thinks I am the worst of the worst, but I said I trust pilots. They should have a chance if there is a terrorist on board. I trust them. Why doesn't this administration trust them? Because of special interests that make billions a year—billions.

It is going to cost us a tiny bit more, and it is a tiny bit more. What price would we put on our kids? There is none, for goodness' sake. If it cost a few cents more to ship a package so a pilot doesn't have to fly 16 hours, isn't that the right thing to do?

I will close with a quote from Sully Sullenberger. I think we all remember Sully. Before we show that, let's remind people who he is. We have another chart that shows him. Sully Sullenberger was the "Hero of the Hudson." We remember how he landed his plane in the Hudson River, how he saved all the passengers on that plane and his crew. He is so famous now, he goes all over the world.

He came to the press conference I had with Senator KLOBUCHAR, because she and I are working on this amendment as well as Senator CANTWELL. His words were inspiring because he did not kid around. He said: "Fatigue is a killer." Fatigue is a killer.

You don't have to say any more. If you know fatigue is a killer, then don't say passenger pilots can fly 9 hours but cargo pilots can fly 16. Here is what Sullenberger said when we first introduced our legislation, the Safe Skies Act: "You wouldn't want your surgeon operating on you after only five hours sleep, or your passenger pilot flying the airplane after only five hours sleep, and you certainly wouldn't want a cargo pilot flying a large plane over your house at 3 a.m. on five hours sleep trying to find the airport and land."

Sully said at the press conference that had he been suffering from fatigue on that fateful day that he safely landed that plane in the waters of the Hudson River, if he was suffering from fatigue, he said he never could have done it.

So I can't get a vote on my amendment. It is so simple, even a 6-year-old can understand it. You don't have disparity when you have the same responsibility. You are traveling in the same skies, and a cargo plane can crash into a house or another plane carrying passengers.

I am so disappointed in this administration that they have not done the right thing on this. I am so disappointed in the U.S. Senate that they blocked a vote on this because the special interests don't want to charge 2 or 3 or 4 cents more on their packages. If it is to save lives of our people, this is what I call a classic no-brainer.

So I am here today to explain my vote to my constituents—why I voted no for an FAA bill that otherwise is a good bill. But I want just to make a statement that it is ridiculous not to give me an up-or-down vote. They tied it to other issues that are poison pills: immigration issues, gun issues. Come on. This is the biggest problem—fatigue.

Can't we just get an up-or-down vote on it? I am going to try to do that at every chance I get. Now I am working on a modified amendment to see if we can get it into a package. I don't know whether we can or not. But I want to say to the pilots out there who may be listening to this debate: A lot of us here have your backs.

We are not going to forget about this issue just because the FAA bill is moving forward. We are not going to forget about you. We are not going to forget about what it means when you are fatigued. We are not going to forget about the two pilots who, through the recorder, told us before they crashed that they were exhausted. They addressed the issue of the disparity. We are going to be fighting on this.

If we can't get it done here, maybe some brave soul in the House will do it, and it will wind up in the bill. If we can't get it done legislatively, we are going to try to get it done through the FAA regular order of their rules. Where is the FAA on this? I want to say: FAA, you turned your back on too many safety measures that the NTSB, which is in charge of our safety, has recommended.

It took years to get some simple things done. So while we are working to get a modified amendment—which is not going to be the be-all and the end-all; it just moves us a little bit forward—I just want to send a message that it is rare that I vote no—one of four. It does not happen often.

I view this as a moral issue. I view this as a moral issue for those pilots that are on duty up to 16 hours straight in the middle of the night, where, as Sully Sullenberger said, their circadian rhythms are off, and they are not at the top of their game. They are flying over the airspace of the American people.

I thank the presiding officer so much for his attention. I live to fight another day, another hour, another minute on this.

I want the pilots to know and the flying public to know and everyone to know they should engage in this issue. There is no disparity between people who do the same work.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. 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. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act, to talk about the importance of passing this legislation for Colorado and, indeed, the Nation. I commend Chairman THUNE, our colleague from South Dakota, Ranking Member NELSON, Senator AYOTTE, and Senator CANTWELL for their work in crafting this very important piece of legislation.

It is an economic driver, certainly a national security issue, and a number of issues that we are able to address in this legislation of great importance to Colorado and the country. Our Nation's airspace is clearly one of the most important economic drivers that we have. It is important in the movement of passengers and cargo, along with the many other users of airspace, whether it be for agriculture or unmanned aerial systems.

The economic importance of aviation in Colorado cannot be stated enough when it comes to tourism. In 2014 alone, 71.3 million visitors came to Colorado, with \$18.6 billion in economic impact for the State, according to the Colorado Tourism Office. That tourism results in well over 100,000 jobs throughout the State of Colorado.

Many of those 71 million tourists came through Denver International Airport, the nation's fifth busiest and largest commercial airport. In 2014 alone, more than 50 million people passed through Denver International Airport, a State with a population of about 5.5 million—50 million people passing through the fifth busiest airport, with some of these passengers continuing on to one of Colorado's additional 13 commercial airports or 60 general aviation airports.

The economic impact that airports and aviation have throughout the State is absolutely incredible. When you take in the multiplier effect, nearly 300,000 jobs are a result of aviation in Colorado—a payroll of about \$12.6 billion in Colorado, with the multiplier effect, for an economic output of about \$36.7 billion.

In fact, there is one airport, which is the premier business airport of the United States, Centennial Airport in Colorado, surrounded by 23 different business parks, with about 6,000 different businesses surrounding this airport in those 23 different business parks. This airport, those 6,000 businesses, and the 23 business parks around the airport account for nearly 27 percent of Colorado's total gross domestic product.

Think about that. One airport, one business airport, and the businesses that surround it account for nearly 27 percent of Colorado's economy. So whether it is skiing or snowboarding or visiting one of our great national parks, enjoying the outdoors, hiking, camping, fishing, or visiting one of our world-class cities, it is not easily achievable without well-run, maintained, and secured airspace.

These airports connect cities like Denver, CO, to Durango, Colorado Springs, Pueblo, and smaller cities; rural communities like the city I live in, Lamar and Yuma; and to the rest of the country. They help businesses reach beyond the borders of our State. Maintaining our airport infrastructure then becomes one of the most critical functions we can perform.

Communities in Colorado and across the country continue to push their airport infrastructure improvements, betterments, to help realize the full potential, the economic potential, to access that airspace and the access that airspace indeed brings. That is why I am glad to talk about this legislation and the many achievements we were able to accomplish and the provisions I was able to secure and include in the bill to help improve that airport infrastructure, including improvements to the Airport Improvement Program, or AIP, and a study with recommendations on upgrading and improving the Nation's airport infrastructure.

Additionally, I am pleased that this bill includes language that I pushed to help allow improvements to Pena Boulevard, the prime access road to connecting Denver International Airport with the rest of Colorado. If you have been to Denver International Airport and you have driven to downtown Denver, you have driven on Pena Boulevard.

This bill will address the needs, the infrastructure, and the improvements that are needed to make sure that Pena Boulevard remains an efficient, safe roadway to the Nation's fifth busiest airport. It will allow DIA the flexibility it needs and the clarity to ensure the primary access road that Pena Boulevard represents is capable of handling the traffic that comes with increased use of the airport.

The bill also includes language that builds on a successful pilot program for virtual towers and ensures that those towers will be eligible for AIP funding, Airport Improvement Program funding, once certified by the FAA.

It is important because these virtual towers, such as the one at the Fort Collins-Loveland airport area, will allow small- and medium-sized airports to offer commercial service in an economically viable and sustainable way. Northern Colorado really is the gateway to Colorado's energy hub, the gateway to Colorado's biotech, bioscience, and engineering research university hub. By allowing this virtual tower in northern Colorado at the Fort Collins-Loveland airport, we can help expand the opportunity to reach that area for businesses that wish to locate there, for customers who wish to fly into the area, and also for those businesses that are already there to expand, to have further reach around the country and the world.

Another central responsibility of the FAA is to ensure that the airspace is being safely managed while allowing the industries that are dependent on

aviation to thrive. I think this legislation, after months and months of work, really does strike that appropriate balance. I was proud to support amendments during consideration of the bill that I believe will help ensure that the Transportation Security Administration, law enforcement agencies, and security personnel have the resources they need to provide for the safety of the traveling public.

I believe more could and should be done, however. That is why I filed on the floor an amendment to the bill which will improve TSA's operations at our airports by creating a testing location to help TSA and airports to work hand in hand to develop future screening technologies and passenger screening methods to ensure we are able to keep passengers and airports safe.

If you look at the needs that we have at airports, there is the combination of coming into an airport and checking in at an airport gate or kiosk. Most people use their iPhone or their smartphone to have their digital print-out of a ticket. They don't even go to a kiosk anymore; they just go straight to the security line. But as we have seen, we need to have an increase in security from curb to gate.

It is not just a security concern where people may be gathering around the screening or people may be getting in and out of cars or lining up at the desk; it is an overall curb-to-gate security approach that we need. That is what my amendment will accomplish. So I look forward to continuing to work with Senator THUNE and the Commerce Committee on a path forward for this amendment because it is critically important that we address additional security measures to prevent violence like the recent terrorist attack in Brussels from happening and occurring at our airports.

To remind people, the attack in Brussels did not happen on an airplane; it happened outside where passengers were gathering. So if we can address this curb-to-gate security, alleviate the slowdowns and the spots that make it more difficult for efficiency at the airport to get through security—this amendment can help do that—we can avoid danger to the public from those who wish to do our people harm.

The bill includes important certification reforms that will improve the processing of new aircraft designs and modifications at the FAA. This is important because we had an agricultural aviator, a crop duster, in Colorado who was trying to get his plane certified. This is a spray plane. He was trying to get this plane certified, but what he found out was that, first, the FAA was taking a very, very long time to certify his crop duster, to give him the permission to use this plane to spray crops.

After they said they found his application, he ended up in a queue, a line behind United Airlines, behind Frontier Airlines. So, basically, this crop duster in southeastern Colorado had a very small plane, not a passenger plane

by any means. He was put in line with a 747, a 757, and a 767. That is nonsense. It doesn't make any sense, and we were able to address those certification challenges in this bill.

A couple of years ago I requested the inspector general at the FAA to look at what was happening in the Rocky Mountain regional facility in Denver. They pointed to a number of challenges that region had in terms of its management, in terms of its process, and in certification in other areas. We were able to include the suggestions and the changes that the inspector general's report identified in this legislation in the FAA today.

Finally, the legislation, of course, makes key strides in the future of our aviation industry by addressing unmanned aerial systems. We have a number of great areas in Colorado where we can test and where we can certify, and, of course, the need is great—from agriculture to our ski resorts to wildfires. Think about what we can accomplish in the future with unmanned aerial assistance.

I thank the leadership. I thank Senator THUNE, our colleague from South Dakota for the leadership he provided. I thank the Presiding Officer for the work the Presiding Officer has done to make this legislation a success.

With that, I urge support for the legislation. I conclude my remarks on the FAA bill asking Members to support the bill.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I compliment the Senator from Colorado for his active participation in shaping this bill. Obviously, he is a very active member of our Commerce Committee and cares deeply and passionately about these issues. He was very involved in the issues that he addressed in his remarks and that were incorporated into this. They were simply and purely a credit to his persistence and hard work. They do make this bill much stronger. I appreciate his good work making that possible.

I wish to say again what I had mentioned earlier today, and that is, as Senator NELSON and I put this bill together, it was done in regular order. We had on the order of seven hearings—either subcommittee or full committee—where we took testimony and tried to assemble the best ideas. We worked together with members of the committee, including the Presiding Officer, in shaping a bill that we brought to a markup—getting it to the markup and through the markup. We adopted 57 amendments—34 Democratic amendments and 23 Republican amendments—before it came to the floor. After coming to the floor last week, we have had 19 amendments that have been added. We have another 30 or thereabouts that have been cleared, if we could get objections withdrawn so

that those amendments could get cleared. But we have some other amendments of Members who would like to get votes.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up and reported by number: Sessions No. 3591; Paul No. 3693, as modified; and Rubio No. 3722; further, that there be 45 minutes of debate concurrently on the amendments, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed with a 60-affirmative-vote threshold required for adoption of the amendments, and that no second-degree amendments be in order prior to the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I so admire the managers of this bill. I really do. As a former chairman and ranking member now, I know how hard this is, but this is not a balanced request.

I would just say that I have spoken on the safety of pilot fatigue so many times. I won't reiterate that here. I feel strongly that I want a vote. I know others on our side do as well. I don't think this is balanced. So, sadly, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, in the same spirit of the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up and reported by number: Boxer No. 3489 and Markey No. 3467; further, that there be 45 minutes of debate to run concurrently on the amendments, equally divided in the usual form; and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with a 60-affirmative-vote threshold required for adoption of the amendments; and that no second-degree amendments be in order prior to the votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. I would simply say that we have worked to try to get the amendment from the Senator from California a vote. We have tried to get the other amendment referenced by the Senator from Florida, Senator MARKEY's amendment, a vote. But we have Members on our side who also want votes, and the other side is objecting to those votes. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, as you may have heard a moment ago, one of

the amendments that is being objected to from our end is an amendment that I have filed, and I will describe it briefly.

I wish to first describe the issue I am trying to address.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "U.S. welfare flows to Cuba" from October 1, 2015.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sun Sentinel, Oct. 1, 2015]

U.S. WELFARE FLOWS TO CUBA

(By Sally Kestin, Megan O'Matz and John Maines with Tracey Eaton in Cuba)

THEY'RE TAKING BENEFITS FROM THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER TO SUBSIDIZE THEIR LIFE IN ANOTHER COUNTRY

Cuban immigrants are cashing in on U.S. welfare and returning to the island, making a mockery of the decades-old premise that they are refugees fleeing persecution at home.

Some stay for months at a time—and the U.S. government keeps paying.

Cubans' unique access to food stamps, disability money and other welfare is meant to help them build new lives in America. Yet these days, it's helping some finance their lives on the communist island.

America's open-ended generosity has grown into an entitlement that exceeds \$680 million a year and is exploited with ease. No agency tracks the scope of the abuse, but a Sun Sentinel investigation found evidence suggesting it is widespread.

Fed-up Floridians are reporting their neighbors and relatives for accepting government aid while shuttling back and forth to the island, selling goods in Cuba, and leaving their benefit cards in the U.S. for others to use while they are away.

Some don't come back at all. The U.S. has continued to deposit welfare checks for as long as two years after the recipients moved back to Cuba for good, federal officials confirmed.

Regulations prohibit welfare recipients from collecting or using U.S. benefits in another country. But on the streets of Hialeah, the first stop for many new arrivals, shopkeepers like Miguel Veloso hear about it all the time.

Veloso, a barber who has been in the U.S. three years, said recent immigrants on welfare talk of spending considerable time in Cuba—six months there, two months here. "You come and go before benefits expire," he said.

State Rep. Manny Diaz Jr. of Hialeah hears it too, from constituents in his heavily Cuban-American district, who tell of flaunting their aid money on visits to the island. The money, he said "is definitely not to be used . . . to go have a great old time back in the country that was supposed to be oppressing you."

The sense of entitlement is so ingrained that Cubans routinely complained to their local congressman about the challenge of accessing U.S. aid—from Cuba.

"A family member would come into our office and say another family member isn't receiving his benefits," said Javier Correoso, aide to former Miami Rep. David Rivera. "We'd say, 'Where is he?' They'd say, 'He's in Cuba and isn't coming back for six months.'"

"They're taking benefits from the American taxpayer to subsidize their life in another country.

One woman told Miami immigration attorney Grisel Ybarra that her grandmother and

two great aunts came to Florida, got approved for benefits, opened bank accounts and returned to Cuba. Month after month, the woman cashed their government checks—about \$2,400 each time—sending half to the women in Cuba and keeping the rest.

When a welfare agency questioned the elderly ladies whereabouts this summer, the woman turned to Ybarra, a Cuban American. She told Ybarra her grandmother refused to come back, saying: "With the money you sent me, I bought a home and am really happy in Cuba."

Cubans on the island, Ybarra said, have a name for U.S. aid.

They call it "la ayuda." The help.

SPECIAL STATUS ABUSED

Increasing openness and travel between the two countries have made the welfare entitlement harder to justify and easier to abuse. But few charges have been brought, and Congress and the Obama Administration have failed to address the problem even as the United States moves toward détente with Cuba.

Cubans' extraordinary access to U.S. welfare rests on two pillars of special treatment: the ease with which they are admitted to the country, and America's generosity in granting them public support.

Cubans are allowed into the U.S. even if they arrive without permission and are quickly granted permanent residency under the 1966 Cuban Adjustment Act. They're assumed to be refugees without having to prove persecution.

They're immediately eligible for welfare, food stamps, Medicaid and Supplemental Security Income or SSI, cash assistance for impoverished seniors and disabled younger people.

Most other immigrants are barred from collecting aid for their first five years. Those here illegally are not eligible at all.

The Sun Sentinel analyzed state and federal data to determine the annual cost of taxpayer support for Cuban immigrants: at least \$680 million. In Florida alone, costs for welfare, food stamps and refugee cash have increased 23 percent from 2011 through 2014.

Not all Cubans receive government help. Those arriving on visas are ineligible, and some rely on family support. And many who receive aid do so for just a short time until they settle in, as the U.S. intended. Cubans over time have become one of the most successful immigrant groups in America.

"They come to the U.S. to work and make a living for their family," said Jose Alvarez, a Cuba native and city commissioner in Kissimmee. "I don't believe that they come thinking the government will support them."

But some take advantage of the easy money—and then go back and forth to Cuba.

A public housing tenant in Hialeah, who was receiving food stamps and SSI payments for a disabled son, frequently traveled to Cuba to sell food there, records show. She admitted to a city housing investigator in 2012 that she "makes \$700 in two months just in the sales to Cuba."

Another man receiving food stamps admitted to state officials "that he was living in Cuba much of 2015."

A recent arrival with a chronic illness got Medicaid coverage and turned to attorney David Batchelder of Miami to help him get SSI as well. But the man was "going back and forth to Cuba" so much that Batchelder eventually dropped the case. "It was just another benefit he was applying for."

Concerns about Cubans exploiting the aid are especially troubling to exiles who came to this country decades ago and built new lives and careers here.

Dr. Noel Fernandez recalls the assistance his family received from friends and the U.S.

government when they immigrated 20 years ago, help that enabled him to find work as a landscaper, learn English and complete his medical studies. Now medical director of Citrus Health Network in Hialeah, Fernandez sees Cuban immigrants collecting benefits and going back, including three elderly patients who recently left the U.S. for good.

"They got Medicaid, they got everything, and they returned to Cuba," he said. "I see people that said they were refugees [from] Cuba and they return the next year."

State officials have received complaints about Cubans collecting aid while repeatedly going to Cuba or working as mules ferrying cash and goods, a common way of financing travel to the island.

Another way of paying for the trips: cheating. Like other welfare recipients, some Cubans work under the table or put assets in others' names to appear poor enough to meet the programs' income limits, according to records and interviews. Some married couples qualify for more money as single people by concealing marriages performed in Cuba, where the U.S. can't access records.

"Stop the fraud please!" one person urged in a complaint to the state. Another pleaded with authorities to check airport departure records for a woman suspected of hiding income. "It would show how many times she has traveled to Cuba."

Florida officials typically dismissed the complaints for lack of information, because names didn't match their records or because the allegations didn't involve violations of eligibility rules. Travel abroad is not expressly prohibited, but benefits are supposed to be used for basic necessities within the U.S.

"Our congressional folks should be looking at this," said Miami-Dade County Commissioner Esteban Bovo Jr., a Cuban American. "There could be millions and millions of dollars in fraud going on here."

MONEY TO CUBA

Accessing benefits from Cuba typically requires a U.S. bank account and a willing relative or friend stateside. Food stamps and welfare are issued monthly through a debit-type card, and SSI payments are deposited into a bank account or onto a MasterCard.

A joint account holder with a PIN number can withdraw the money and wire it to Cuba. Another option: entrust the money to a friend traveling to Cuba.

Roberto Pizano of Tampa, a political prisoner in Cuba for 18 years, said he worked two jobs when he arrived in the U.S. in 1979 and never accepted government help. He now sees immigrants "abusing the system."

"I know people who come to the U.S., apply for SSI and never worked in the USA," he said. They "move back to Cuba and are living off of the hard-earned taxpayer dollars."

He said family friend Gilberto Reyno got disability money from the U.S. and renovated a house in Cuba. The Sun Sentinel found Reyna living in that house in Camaguey, Cuba. He said he was no longer receiving disability, but Pizano and another person familiar with the situation said the payments continue to be deposited into a U.S. bank account. The Social Security Administration would not comment, citing privacy concerns, but is investigating.

Federal investigators have found the same scenario in other cases.

A 2012 complaint alleged a 75-year-old woman had moved to Camaguey two years earlier and a relative was withdrawing her SSI money from a bank account and sending it to her. Social Security stopped payments, but not before nearly \$16,000 had been deposited into her account.

Another recipient went to Cuba on vacation and stayed, leaving his debit card with

a relative. Social Security continued his SSI payments for another six months—\$4,000 total—before an anonymous caller reported he had gone back to Cuba.

One woman reportedly moved to Cuba in 2010 and died three years later, while still receiving SSI and food stamps, according to a 2014 tip to Florida welfare fraud investigators. A state official couldn't find her at her Hialeah home, cut off the food stamps and alerted the federal government.

Former congressman Rivera tried to curb abuses with a bill that would have revoked the legal status of Cubans who returned to the island before they became citizens.

"Public assistance is meant to help Cuban refugees settle in the U.S.," Mauricio Claver-Carone of Cuba Democracy Advocates testified in a 2012 hearing on the bill. "However, many non-refugee Cubans currently use these benefits, which can average more than \$1,000 per month, to immediately travel back to the island, where the average income is \$20 per month, and comfortably reside there for months at a time on the taxpayer's dime."

Rivera recently told the Sun Sentinel that he interviewed welfare workers, Cubans in Miami and passengers waiting for charter flights to Havana. He said he found overwhelming evidence of benefits money going back, especially after the U.S. eased travel restrictions in 2009.

The back and forth undermines the rationale that Cubans are refugees fleeing an oppressive government, Rivera said. And when they return for visits, they boast of the money that's available in the U.S., he said. "They all say, 'It's great. I got free housing. I got free food. I get my medicine.'"

Five Cubans interviewed by the Sun Sentinel in Havana said they were aware of the assistance and knew of Cubans who had gone to America and quickly began sending money back. Two said they believed it was U.S. government aid.

"I don't think it's correct, but everyone does it for the well-being of their family," said one woman, Susana, who declined to give her last name.

Outside welfare offices in Hialeah, the Sun Sentinel found Cuban immigrants who had arrived as recently as three days earlier, applying for benefits. They said family and friends told them about the aid before they left Cuba.

"Back in the '60s, when you came in, they told you the factory that was hiring," said Nidia Diaz of Miami, a former bail bondswoman who was born in Cuba. "Now, they tell you the closest Department of Children and Families [office] so you can go and apply."

CROOKS COLLECT IN CUBA

Miami bail bondswoman Barbara Pozo said many of her Cuban clients talk openly about living in Cuba and collecting monthly disability checks, courtesy of U.S. taxpayers.

"They just come here to pick up the money," Pozo said. "They pretend they're disabled. They just pretend they're crazy."

SSI payments, for those who cannot work due to mental or physical disabilities, go up to \$733 a month for an individual. Most other new immigrants are ineligible until they become U.S. citizens.

Some Cubans try to build a case for SSI by claiming trauma from their life under an oppressive government or the 90-mile crossing to Florida.

Diaz, the former bondswoman, said she has heard Cuban clients talk about qualifying: "Tell them that you have emotional problems. How did you get these problems? Well, trying to get here from Cuba."

Antonio Comin collected disability while organizing missions to smuggle Cubans to

Florida, including one launched from a house in the Keys, federal prosecutors said. Comin claimed he rented the home to celebrate his birthday—after receiving his government check.

Casimiro Martinez was receiving a monthly check for a mental disability—but his mind was sound enough to launder more than \$1 million stolen from Medicare. Martinez was arrested at Miami International Airport after returning from a trip to Cuba.

Government disability programs are vulnerable to fraud, particularly SSI, with applicants faking or exaggerating symptoms. Some view SSI as "money waiting to be taken," said John Webb, a federal prosecutor in Tennessee who has handled fraud cases.

While benefits are supposed to be suspended for recipients who leave the United States for more than 30 days, the government relies on people to self-report those absences, and federal audits have found widespread violations.

The government could significantly reduce abuses by matching international travel records to SSI payments, auditors have recommended since 2003. The Social Security Administration and Department of Homeland Security are still trying to work out a data sharing agreement—12 years later.

Jose Caragol, a Hialeah city councilman and Havana native, said aid for Cubans "was meant to assist those who were persecuted and want a new life. The bleeding has to stop."

Mr. RUBIO. I will not read the whole article. But I am going to paraphrase from it.

By the way, as to the Democratic amendments that have been proposed and on which the Senator from California has just made a presentation regarding travel issues and pilot hours—she referred to the fact I have traveled extensively over the last year—they are issues I am actually very sympathetic toward. Perhaps we can work together to get her a vote on that amendment, because I think that is a legitimate issue.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you.

Mr. RUBIO. Let me now talk about the one I want to talk about. This is how the article begins. I talked about yesterday.

Let me back up and explain what people are facing. Today, if an immigrant enters the United States from another country legally and comes here on a green card, with 5-year residency, they cannot receive Federal benefits. If you immigrate to the United States from any country in the world with an immigrant visa legally—not illegal immigration, as illegal immigrants do not qualify for Federal benefits—a legal immigrant to the United States does not qualify for any Federal benefits. There is an exception in the law, however, and that is if you happen to be someone who comes from Cuba without a visa.

There is a law called the Cuban Adjustment Act. When the Cuban Adjustment Act was passed during the Cold War, it was passed so that Cubans who came to the United States fleeing communist oppression were immediately admitted to the United States. In essence, that is why there is really no such thing as an illegal immigrant from Cuba. If a Cuban makes it to the

shores of the United States, they become legal in this country, and a year and a day after they have arrived, they are allowed to apply for a green card. But unlike any immigrant from any part of the world, they are allowed to receive Federal benefits because they are automatically presumed to be refugees. That is a status that I am not trying to change in terms of the Cuban Adjustment Act. I have said that I am open to that being examined, but I am not trying to change that law in my amendment.

I do want to discuss why we should automatically assume at this point that anyone who comes from Cuba is a political refugee. The reason why that now is in doubt is because many of the people who are coming from Cuba, supposedly as refugees seeking to flee oppression, are traveling back to Cuba 15, 20, 30 times a year.

There are people being oppressed politically in Cuba, absolutely. It is one of the reasons why I think the President's policies toward Cuba have been misguided, because they refuse to see that even after this opening to Cuba, the political situation on the island has deteriorated. It has gotten worse, not better. There are absolutely people from Cuba who are coming here as refugees. But we also cannot ignore the fact that many of the people coming from Cuba no longer are coming here for political reasons. The evidence is that shortly after they arrive, they are going back to Cuba 15, 20, 30 times a year. You do not normally travel back to a place where you are fleeing from oppression, much less repeatedly over an extended period of time.

So as a result, we now have a law that basically says that if you come from Cuba, you are automatically entitled to a full platform of Federal benefits.

This is how the article begins:

Cuban immigrants are cashing in on U.S. welfare and returning to the island, making a mockery of the decades-old premise that they are refugees fleeing persecution at home. . . .

Cubans' unique access to food stamps, disability money, and other welfare is meant to help them build new lives in America. Yet these days, it's helping some finance their lives on the communist island.

America's open-ended generosity has grown into an entitlement that exceeds \$680 million a year and is exploited with ease. No agency tracks the scope of this abuse, but a Sun Sentinel investigation found evidence suggesting it is widespread.

Fed-up Floridians—

Where a lot of these Cubans are moving to—

are reporting their neighbors and their relatives for accepting government aid while shuttling back and forth to the island, selling goods in Cuba and leaving their benefit cards in the U.S. for others to use while they are away.

Some do not even come back at all. The U.S. has continued to deposit welfare checks for as long as two years after the recipients moved back to Cuba for good.

It goes on to talk about several people. For example there is a shopkeeper

in Hialeah, FL, where a lot of these folks are coming and moving. He says he hears about it all the time. He is a barber. He has been in the United States for 3 years, and he said:

Recent immigrants on welfare talk of spending considerable time in Cuba—six months there, two months here. “You come and go before benefits expire.”

The article goes on:

The sense of entitlement is so ingrained that Cubans are now routinely complaining to the local Congressman about the challenge of accessing U.S. aid—from Cuba.

What they are complaining about is that they are coming into the office. This is what a former aide to a former Congressman from Miami said: A family member would come into our office and say a family member isn’t receiving his benefits. They would ask: Where is he? And they would say: He is in Cuba, and he isn’t coming back for 6 months.

This is unreal. There are people coming into congressional offices complaining: We are having trouble getting access to our benefits. You ask them why, and they say it is because the person who gets the benefits is not in America; he is in Cuba and he can’t get access to his benefits from Cuba.

One woman told Miami immigration attorney Grisel Ybarra that her grandmother and two great aunts came to Florida, got approved for benefits, opened bank accounts and returned to Cuba. Month after month, the woman cashed their government checks—about \$2,400 each time—sending half to the women in Cuba and keeping the rest.

They kept for themselves a 50 percent commission.

When a welfare agency questioned the elderly ladies’ whereabouts this summer, the woman turned to Ybarra, a Cuban American. She told Ybarra her grandmother refused to come back, saying: “With the money you sent me, I bought a home and I am really happy in Cuba.”

That means your money—the American taxpayers’ money.

Ybarra went on to say that the Cubans on the island have a name for this U.S. aid. It is called “la ayuda,” which means the help.

Cubans are allowed into the U.S. even if they arrive without permission and are quickly granted permanent residency. . . .

As I said earlier, under the 1966 Cuban Adjustment Act, they are automatically assumed to be refugees without having to prove it.

They are immediately eligible for welfare, for food stamps, for Medicaid, and for supplemental social security, or SSI, and also cash assistance for impoverished seniors and for disabled young people.

But let’s be frank, not all Cubans receive government aid. For example, if you come to the United States from Cuba on a visa—because there is a visa lottery and every year the government awards visas to people living in Cuba—you do not qualify for these benefits.

If, however, you arrive in the United States on a raft or if you fly on an airplane to Costa Rica, Honduras, Guatemala, or Mexico and cross the U.S. bor-

der—as is now increasingly happening—then you do qualify for these benefits I have just outlined. So let’s be frank, not everyone who is coming from Cuba is doing this. There are people coming from Cuba who are fleeing persecution, but many are taking advantage of the easy money, and then they are going back and forth to Cuba.

I will give you some examples cited in this article:

A public housing tenant in Hialeah, who was receiving food stamps and SSI payments for a disabled son, frequently traveled to Cuba to sell food there, records showed. She admitted to a city housing investigator in 2012 that she “makes \$700 in two months just in the sales to Cuba.”

And \$700 a month is a lot of money in Cuba.

How does this work? They take the food stamp card. They go to the grocery store. They load up a van with canned goods. They travel back to Cuba. They just got that food with your taxpayer money. They travel back to Cuba with duffel bags full of canned goods, and they sell it in Cuba for a profit—\$700 over a 2-month period.

Another man receiving food stamps admitted to State officials “that he was living in Cuba for much of 2015.”

A recent arrival with a chronic illness got Medicaid coverage and turned to [his] attorney . . . of Miami to help him get SSI as well. But the man was “going back and forth to Cuba” so much that Batchelder eventually dropped the case. “It was just another benefit he was applying for.”

This, of course, concerns people who came to the United States as exiles and are now watching this happen. There is a doctor whose name is Noel Fernandez, and he recalls when his family arrived here from Cuba that the U.S. Government helped them a little. When they immigrated here 20 years ago, he was helped to find work as a landscaper, he was helped to learn English, and he was helped to complete his medical studies. Today he is the medical director of Citrus Health Network in Hialeah.

Fernandez sees Cuban immigrants collecting benefits and then going back, including three elderly patients who recently left the United States for good.

“They got Medicaid, they got everything, and they returned to Cuba,” he said. “I see people that said they were refugees [from] Cuba and they return the next year.”

That is his quote.

State officials—

In my home State of Florida—have received complaints about Cubans collecting aid while repeatedly going to Cuba or working as mules ferrying cash and goods, which is a common way of financing travel to the island.

How that works is, people know you are traveling to Cuba, and they have relatives they want to get money to or clothes to or whatever, and so they pay you. They actually pay you. They give you money and they say: Will you take this with you on your trip to Cuba and deliver it to the people we are trying to get it to? That is why they call them a

mule. Well, from the money you get paid to take these things back to Cuba, that is how you pay for your plane ticket.

Another way of paying for these trips, by the way, is cheating. According to the Sentinel article:

Like other welfare recipients, some Cubans work under the table or put their assets in others’ names to appear poor enough to meet the programs’ income limits, according to records and interviews. Some married couples qualify for more money as single people.

Many of our welfare programs actually give you more money if you are not married because you don’t have to combine your incomes. So because they were married in Cuba, they simply conceal the fact that they are married because the United States can’t access those records. That is another way of cheating.

Now look, “accessing benefits from [someone who is in] Cuba typically requires a U.S. bank account and a willing relative or friend stateside.” By the way, that is just for now because as part of this opening to Cuba, the Obama administration is going to make it easier for there to be banking transactions with Cuba. So what we are facing here, my friends, is that in a very short period of time—once banking becomes regularized with American banks—they will not even need to rely on their relatives in order to get this stuff. All they are going to need is an ATM or debit card or a credit card secured to that account, and you—the American taxpayer—will deposit the welfare check, the SSI, into their bank account, and they will then be conducting transactions or withdrawing the cash from Cuba directly.

So they will not even need a relative to do it, but right now they still need that. “Food stamps and welfare are issued monthly to a debit-type card and SSI payments are deposited into a bank account or onto a MasterCard.” And soon they will be able to use that in Cuba. Then what you need is “a joint account holder with a PIN number who can withdraw the money and wire it to you in Cuba.”

Another option is just to entrust the money to a friend who is traveling to Cuba.

Roberto Pizano of Tampa, a political prisoner in Cuba for 18 years, said he worked two jobs when he arrived in the U.S. in 1979 and never accepted government help. He now sees immigrants “abusing the system.”

He says he has a “family friend,” and this family friend got “disability money from the U.S.” and with the disability money he “renovated a house in Cuba.” The Sun Sentinel found this man. His name is Gilberto Reyno. You know where they found him? They found him living in Camaguey, Cuba. Quoting from the article:

The Sun Sentinel found Reyno living in that house in Camaguey, Cuba. He said he was no longer receiving disability, but Pizano and another person familiar with the situation said the payments continue to be deposited into a U.S. bank account.

Here is another example that Federal investigators found, according to the article:

A 2012 complaint alleged a 75-year-old woman had moved to Camaguey two years earlier and a relative was withdrawing her SSI money from a bank account and sending it to her. Social Security stopped payments, but not before nearly \$16,000 had been deposited into her account.

Another recipient went to Cuba on vacation and then stayed, leaving his debit card with a relative. Social Security continued his SSI payments for another six months—\$4,000 total—before an anonymous caller reported he had gone back to Cuba.

One woman reportedly moved to Cuba in 2010 and died three years later, while still receiving SSI and food stamps, according to a 2014 tip to Florida welfare fraud investigators.

Five Cubans interviewed by the Sun Sentinel in Havana said they were aware of the assistance and knew of Cubans who had gone to America and quickly began sending money back. Two said they believed it was U.S. government aid.

That means this is now spreading through word-of-mouth. So you live in Cuba, you know someone who left for the United States, they qualified for these benefits, and they start coming back and bringing the money with them or sending it back to their relatives, and word gets around. That is why it is not a surprise to read in this article:

Outside welfare offices in Hialeah, the Sun Sentinel found Cuban immigrants who had arrived as recently as three days earlier, applying for benefits. They said family and friends told them about the aid before they left Cuba.

"Back in the '60s, when you came in, they told you the factory that was hiring," said Nidia Diaz of Miami, a former bail bondswoman who was born in Cuba. "Now they tell you the closest Department of Children and Families [office] so you can go and apply."

This is a quote from another bail bondswoman:

Miami bail bondswoman Barbara Pozo said many of her Cuban clients talk openly about living in Cuba and collecting monthly disability checks, courtesy of U.S. taxpayers.

"They just come here to pick up the money," Pozo said. "They pretend they're disabled. They just pretend they're crazy."

SSI payments, for those who cannot work due to mental or physical disabilities, go up to \$733 a month for an individual. Most other new immigrants are ineligible until they become U.S. citizens.

Some Cubans try to build a case for SSI by claiming trauma from their life under an oppressive government or the 90-mile crossing to Florida.

Diaz, the former bondswoman, said she has heard Cuban clients talk about qualifying: "Tell them that you have emotional problems. How did you get these problems? Well, trying to get here from Cuba."

Here is one that should really gall everybody, though these are all bad stories.

Antonio Comin collected disability while organizing missions to smuggle Cubans to Florida, including one he launched from a house in the Keys. Federal prosecutors said. Comin claimed he rented the home to celebrate his birthday—after receiving his government check.

Casimiro Martinez was receiving a monthly check for a mental disability—but his

mind was sound enough to launder more than \$1 million stolen from Medicare. Martinez was arrested at Miami International Airport after returning from a trip to Cuba.

While benefits are supposed to be suspended for recipients who leave the United States for more than 30 days, the government relies on people to self-report those absences, and Federal audits have found widespread violations.

So the only way you can find that someone is actually doing this is they have to call and say: Hey, by the way, I am now living in Cuba, and I am still collecting my checks. Well, that ain't gonna happen. This is an outrage.

Listen, my parents came from Cuba. I live in a community where Cuban exiles are a plurality of the people who live there. So no one can say this is an anti-immigrant thing or a mean-spirited thing. We have the support of every elected Cuban American Member of the House for this idea.

I myself come from a Cuban American family. This is an outrage. It is happening right underneath our noses. Who can be for this? Let me rephrase it. Who can be against doing something about this? We are talking about close to \$700 million a year of American taxpayer money that could be spent right now to deal with the Zika virus issue that we are facing, for example. Instead, this money is being abused. It is being stolen.

So one would think: Wow, that is a commonsense thing; right? People here in the gallery, people at home—if anyone is actually watching C-span—would say: That is common sense. They will do something about it. Yet I can't get a vote on this amendment. I cannot get the Senate to vote on an amendment to stop this practice.

Here is the only thing I am asking. I am asking that if you come from Cuba, you have to prove you are a refugee. Prove that to us. I am not even saying we are not going to let you in. I am just saying that if you come from Cuba using the Cuban Adjustment Act, prove that you have been persecuted in Cuba. That is not hard to do. You were in jail; you were beaten. We know who the people are who are being persecuted. All I am saying is prove that you are a refugee, and then you will qualify for the benefits because we help refugees. But, apparently, that is too much to ask.

Here is the thing. Everybody here comes up to me and says: I am for your amendment. I support what you are trying to do. Great. Why can't we vote on it? We can't vote on it because if we give you your amendment, then we have to give the other side their amendments. And let me just tell you guys that this is why people are so sick of politics.

I don't want to get too much into the weeds on this, but suffice it to say I have spent from April 13 of 2015 through very recently traveling all over this country on another endeavor, and one of the things you hear from people is that they are just angry. They are just fed up. They think: No-

body whom we elect, whom we vote for, whom we send to Washington—nothing ever changes or happens. It doesn't matter. You can vote Republican, you can vote Democrat, or you can vote for a vegetarian. It doesn't matter whom you vote for. Nothing happens. These people don't do anything.

They are right. I have just come here today and laid this out. No one can argue against what I have just said—no one. I challenge any Member of this Senate to come here now—I will give the rest of the time I have apportioned to me—and tell me why changing this is a bad idea. But I can't even vote get a vote on an amendment to change this.

The excuses are long: Oh, we can't do it because we don't want to open the tax portion of the bill because then other people will want their amendments. This is crazy. This is nuts. We can't solve problems. We can't solve something as clear and simple as that. We can't even get a vote. If you want to vote against what I am proposing, vote against it. We can't even get a vote on an amendment like this. It makes no sense.

This is not a small issue. We are talking \$700 million. This is not an issue of national coverage. It is not in the news every day. This is not controversial. This is bipartisan. The chairwoman of the Democratic National Committee, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, a Congresswoman from Florida, is a cosponsor of this bill in the House. So this is not partisan. It is not about getting anyone elected to anything. I am not running for anything. This is about doing what is right.

This is about being able to go back to my home community and say to people: This abuse has been addressed. But if I go home tonight or tomorrow to Florida and I run into somebody at the grocery store, I can't explain to them with a straight face why the Senate will not give me a vote on this because it makes no sense. If I came to you and said: They are stealing \$700 million a year from you, and here is a very simple way to stop it, you would say: Let's do it. We have to do it. But here they are saying: We can't do it. And no one will tell you why we can't do it, except for some procedural internal Senate thing.

This is ridiculous. This is why people are angry. This is why people are so upset. This is why people have taken on this attitude to get rid of everyone. And I have to tell you, it is hard to blame them after seeing what is happening here now. This is total and complete outrage.

There is another amendment being debated, by the way, by Senator SESSIONS. It is another one of the amendments that was denied a vote. It has to do with the entry-exit tracking system, which basically means that when you come into the United States with a visa—you get a visa to visit the United States for 90 days as a tourist. You want to go to Washington, you want to

go to Disney World, you want to go to New York City, and you have 60 to 90 days to visit the United States. When you arrive, we check you in. But we never check you out. So we never know when or if someone has left.

As a result, today, of the 12 or 13 or 14 million people who are here illegally, about 40 percent or so of them are people who have overstayed their visas. They didn't cross the border illegally. They came on an airplane, and they overstayed their visa.

Everyone says they are in favor of a system that tracks entries and exits so we can crack down on these overstayed visas. Everyone says they are in favor of it. In 2013, the Senate passed a controversial immigration reform bill that I was a part of and we helped craft, and an entry-exit tracking system was part of that bill.

Everyone—Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative—says they are in favor of doing that. But you can't get a vote on an amendment dealing with it. Again, it makes no sense. This place can't solve anything, and this is ridiculous.

So what happens when you don't solve things for a long time? The problems stack up. The problems stack up and people lose confidence. People lose faith.

Look, I understand this process. I know everyone is not always going to get everything. You are not going to achieve everything you want when you get involved in these issues, but these are commonsense issues. An entry-exit tracking system—of course that makes sense.

By the way, you have to do that on the FAA bill. You have to because that has to do with airports where most of the entry-exits are happening. This issue is drafted to this bill because this bill has a piece of it that deals with the Tax Code and finance. A moment ago, the chairman said we had a lot of debate. They had an open amendment process on the FAA bill, but there is a finance component to this bill that was not offered until it got here. That is what my amendment is drafted on, so I couldn't have offered this in a committee.

I think people come to Washington and watch this process; they hear me explain this thing. They are wondering, there has to be a catch, right? What is the other side of the argument? There is no other side of the argument. There is none. There is none.

Why should you, the people watching, the people here, why should anybody, why should the American taxpayer be giving money to people who don't live here to build houses in another country? That is what is happening right underneath our noses. Forget about passing it. You can't even get a vote on it, for reasons no one can explain.

Do you want to know why people are upset and frustrated with the political process? This is a small but important example of why people are so frus-

trated. I hope this will change. I hope it will change. I hope it will change on this bill because I don't think you can explain with a straight face why something like this can't pass or why something like this can't even get a vote on it. This makes absolutely no sense, but this is what is happening here every single day on a routine basis. When I say "here," I mean in Washington. The result is, people start to scratch their heads and say: You know what. It doesn't matter whom we elect, nothing changes. That explains a lot about the frustrations that are going on in this country. I hope that will change.

HONORING ASSAULT BRIGADE 2506

Madam President, I want to talk about another topic briefly. It is also related to Cuba but on a much different note. It has to do with the Bay of Pigs, which is something that happened a while back. April 17 will mark the anniversary of a significant event in history. It is an event that many in our government over the years have been eager to forget and is often cited as a blemish on our history, but I beg to differ in some ways. The result wasn't what we wanted, but we have a lot to be proud of. I think it has become increasingly important to remember.

Fifty-five years ago this Sunday, on April 17, 1961, there were 1,500 brave volunteers who embarked upon a mission to liberate Cuba from Fidel Castro's oppressive grip. This force was primarily made up of Cuban exiles, but they were a diverse group from all backgrounds within Cuban society.

They knew they would be badly outnumbered and they would face extraordinary odds. Yet these men stormed the beaches of Playa Giron at the Bay of Pigs. They did it for what at the time was their country, Cuba. They did it for their families. They did it for freedom itself. Over the next 4 days, nearly 100 members of the Brigada de Asalto—Assault Brigade 2506—lost their lives—nearly 100 members. Included in that number were four American pilots and five others who were executed. The majority were captured and imprisoned for many months and years and in inhumane conditions.

Though the Bay of Pigs invasion failed, it was a triumph of courage for the brave Cuban exiles at the mission's helm, and it serves as a reminder of an era when the U.S. Government actually embraced America's role as the watchman on the walls of freedom.

Since taking power those many years ago, the anti-American Castro regime has never relented in its attempts to undermine our security and suppress its own people. More than 1 million Cubans have voted with their feet, fleeing the island in search of political freedom or better economic conditions—we just discussed that a moment ago—often coming to the United States.

Many of these refugees are my neighbors, my friends, and constituents. My own parents left Cuba several years before Castro took over, but their lives were nonetheless marred by his rule as

well. The relationships with family and friends and access to their homeland were abruptly severed.

For the nearly 1,500 Cuban exiles who made up the Assault Brigade 2506, Fidel Castro was not the leader of their country. He was what he has always been—a thief and an imposter. They knew liberty was a God-given right, and they needed to do all in their power to reclaim it.

Their story says as much about their own resilience as it does about America. The very building I stand in, and the proud body I am a Member of, would not exist were it not for men like them over 150 years before.

America's Declaration of Independence says of mankind's inalienable rights that "whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government."

Those who undertook the Bay of Pigs invasion fought for their country, not against it. Their cause was a humanitarian cause, a noble cause, in many ways, an American cause. Many of those who were captured and eventually released and exiled to the United States came with nothing—not a penny—and in many cases no English skills. They went to work and embraced America's blessings, but they never forgot their homeland.

Some made it their life's work to promote the cause of a free Cuba. Others went to work on a different endeavor to provide for their families but dedicated countless hours as faithful volunteers of the cause. Many of the former members of the Brigade 2506 would take up arms for the United States, serving in our Armed Forces with the same bravery and distinction they showed at the Bay of Pigs. In doing so, they served as teachers to an entire community.

For example, today in Miami a Brigade 2506 monument and museum now exists as much to commemorate these heroes as they do to educate others. Far from being forgotten, the example of these brave men has inspired others to carry on their work. Their legacy lives, and it lives on among those of us who follow in their footsteps by making their cause of a free Cuba our cause.

Today the spirit of those who paid the ultimate price is alive and well in the brigade's Veterans Association and continues to stand firmly against the Castro brothers' dictatorship. Their spirit is also alive inside Cuba, represented by all those who stand up to the repressive regime and its beatings, detentions, and suppressions of speech. A strong dissident movement within the island refuses to be silenced, demanding change and the right of every human being to be free.

Sadly, this administration has betrayed that spirit of dissension by treating the Castro government as if it were democratically elected. The President's actions have only motivated the dictatorship to increase in

its very nature, but as long as the spirit of the brigade lives on, the dream of a free Cuba will never die.

Following the Bay of Pigs invasion, in December of 1962, President Kennedy delivered a speech in Miami honoring those who fought. Accepting an honor from them in return, he accepted the flag of their brigade. President Kennedy said: "I can assure you that this flag will be returned to this brigade in a free Havana."

That assurance was not made by a man but by a nation. It came with no expiration date. I believe we as Americans owe it to the fearless men who fought at the Bay of Pigs to ensure that their flag, which last touched the shores of Cuba 55 years ago this week, is one day returned to a free Havana and that everything that flag represents—freedom, sacrifice, the dreams of the Cuban people—remains the cause of the United States.

To the veterans of Assault Brigade 2506, thank you for your service and God bless you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I thank Senator RUBIO for his comments and his heartfelt expressions. It is important, and his amendment is very commonsensical. It deals with a very real abuse that I know he and many Cuban Americans understand to be an abuse and want to see ended. This would be a good opportunity for us to pass it, and I understand Senator RUBIO's frustrations that we seem to be unable to fix problems around this body.

That is my feeling this afternoon, too—this frustration that we are not able to finally take action on things like the entry-exit visa system and complete it, as we promised to do for years. We get very close, but we don't get there. I thank Senator RUBIO for his excellent leadership on this issue and support for the amendment that I have worked on. I think it is very reasonable and an appropriate amendment. It gives plenty of opportunity for us to carry out the necessary program in a reasonable way.

The amendment I submitted will ensure the implementation of the statutorily required biometric exit system. It has been in law for a long time. It was first set in law in 1996—20 years ago. There were at least eight or more times where we mandated this legislation. The first one was in 1996. These requirements were basically ignored. They were eventually modified and then the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, occurred.

Congress responded to that by demanding the government implement this entry-exit system when we passed the PATRIOT Act to provide greater security for America. It stated that an entry-exit data system should be fully implemented for airports, seaports, land border ports of entry "with all deliberate speed and as expeditiously as practical." That was in 2001.

If you remember what happened after 9/11, we had a 9/11 Commission—and it was a bipartisan Commission—and that Commission was charged with a serious responsibility of analyzing our immigration system, analyzing our public safety system, our intelligence system, and all kinds of problems that made us more vulnerable than we need to be. One of their recommendations was that we have a system when you come into America on a visa, you clock yourself in—like many workplaces have—and you clock yourself out when you leave the country and your time on your visa expires. Then the United States would know who would come and who had exited.

Of course, we also know, if you recall back to that day, a number of the 9/11 attackers who killed 3,000 Americans came on visas lawfully. Several of them overstayed with the visas they had. So this was the response.

We have the capability of doing this. We have had the capability for many years, and it has not happened. Ten years after 2001, the 9/11 attack, the 9/11 Commissioners met again. The purpose of their meeting was to ascertain how much of what they had recommended had actually been accomplished by the U.S. Government. One of the very first things they noted was the failure to complete the exit system. This is why it has become such a big issue.

In 2002 we passed a law that further moved forward with the system. It required the government to install biometric readers and scanners at all ports of entry of the United States. In fact, we have a system to collect biometric information from individuals who wish to enter the country, but oddly we don't have the exit system. Why is it so much harder to have a system to allow you to document your exit than it is to document your entry? This is a serious problem.

Subsequently, and consistent with the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, Congress passed the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which mandated the entry-exit system be complete and be biometrically based. That is different from biographic. In a biographically-based system, you give your Social Security number and name and they check to see if somebody has a warrant out for your arrest or if you should be on a no-fly list or if you are connected with terrorism or organized crime or drug-dealing gangs or whatever is in our systems. You can just give a false name. That is not a very secure system at all.

What the 9/11 Commission correctly concluded was, if you used a biometric system where they read your fingerprints, somebody couldn't come in and say they are John Jones and they are really Ralph Smith, who has a warrant out for his arrest for terrorism somewhere. That is the kind of thing this system was designed to do and can be done.

Despite the relatively successful implementation of a biometric entry system, the Department has largely failed to implement the requirements. To date, the Department of Homeland Security has only implemented a handful of pilot programs. It is not hard to do. Yet they have been dragging their feet for years now. However, there are some promising developments on this system. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2016 created a dedicated source of money for implementation of the biometric exit. It has been estimated that this will result in approximately \$1 billion in funds that will be used solely for the implementation of the biometric exit system. That is already in law and required to be a part of our legal and immigration system.

Yet, even with this source of funding, hurdles remain to the implementation of this system. My amendment will remove one of the biggest remaining hurdles to the implementation of the system. It simply states that no funds from this Federal aviation bill, which funds airports, runways, safety systems, and all of those different systems, can be expended "for the physical modification of any existing air navigation facility that is a port of entry or construction of a new air navigation facility intended to be a port of entry, unless the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies that the owner or sponsor of the facility has agreed to a plan that guarantees the installation and implementation of the [biometric exit system] at such facility not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Act." In other words, it gives them 2 years. They have to reach an agreement to actually take steps to fix this problem.

I modified my amendment in an attempt to address some concerns that were raised by the airlines by explicitly referring to the \$1 billion appropriated for this system. We received positive feedback from U.S. Customs and Border Protection, which has to deal with this every day. My amendment also has been endorsed by the Border Patrol Union. They know this is a loophole in our system, a gaping hole in our security. They want to see it completed, and it is long overdue.

The amendment allows the U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers and each airport that serves as a port of entry to create a solution that works specifically for the needs of the CBP and the limitations of each individual airport. It does require, however, that the parties agree to a plan that guarantees the system will be installed and implemented.

The suggestions we have had in response as to the kind of language critics and objectors would like to see—it never has an end date. They say, well, you can begin a pilot project or you can do this, that, and the other, but they never give a date as to when it should actually be completed.

Colleagues, this system can be made to work. In my opinion, it can be implemented in every airport in 6

months. We have companies that have this kind of system that is used all over the place, and even Disney World and Disneyland use a fingerprint system. It is on our cell phones. This is the kind of thing that is really no problem to make happen, but we lack the will and determination to see it through, and we let people who don't like it—special interest groups—push back, and as a result, it somehow never gets completed.

In fact, Homeland Security, airports, and airlines have already had a generous amount of time in which to get this completed. It could be done quickly.

One manufacturer said: We should host a special products day. You should just have a day out here. People think it can't be done. Have a day and ask all the manufacturers around the country to bring forth their equipment that is being used in businesses and places all over the country, such as nuclear plants, and set them up and let us show you what we can do with it.

Another company said: You don't even have to touch a screen. You can wave your hand in front of the screen, and it will read your fingerprints.

These are proven products, and the prices are low and falling and at the most basic level. If Apple and Samsung can put it on their phones, we can certainly do it at the airports.

The special interests also say it will take up a lot of space. It will not take up a lot of space. Police officers have these kinds of fingerprint-reading systems in their automobiles. When they arrest somebody for a crime and want to know if there is a warrant for that person's arrest somewhere around the country, they ask that person to put their hand on the screen. The computer reads it and runs the fingerprint against the National Crime Information Center records. If it says bingo, there is a warrant for his arrest for murder, robbery, or drug dealing, they can detain that person.

CBP can work with larger airports with international terminals and install physical equipment at their international departure gates. It is only the international departure gates. CBP—Customs and Border Patrol—can work with smaller airports and even deploy handheld systems similar to the ones that are in cars at the gates that handle international flights. Ultimately, all passengers exiting the United States need to do is place their hands on a simple screen—or with some devices, just wave their hands at it—and it will biometrically identify the passenger as truly the one shown on the flight documents as exiting the United States.

You can come here with a false document. Terrorists work on these things all the time. Terrorists use false identification. We know there are systems out there making them by the thousands and tens of thousands. But if your fingerprint doesn't match the fingerprint of the person whose name you

are using and it turns out to match somebody who is on a terrorist watch list, then you can stop it and create safety. If a person puts out their hand and there is a hit because the person boarding the plane is on a no-fly list, the passenger can be denied boarding or removed from the plane before it takes off, and their baggage can be removed from the plane before it takes off.

Importantly, the United States will have a unified, automatically produced list of people who departed when their visa said they should depart and a list of people who did not depart when their visa expired.

By the way, colleagues, several years ago the Congressional Budget Office found that 40-plus percent of people illegally in America came by visa. They came legally; they just did not leave. They said that number is increasing. I believe it is increasing rather rapidly, and we are going to see more of it in the future. If you don't have a system to identify people who overstay their lawful entry, then you do not have a lawful system of immigration. It is just that simple.

For a host of reasons, this system should be based on fingerprints.

The former Secretary of Homeland Security and former Governor of Pennsylvania, Secretary Ridge, set up this system some time ago. When I talked to him about it, I told him as a former prosecutor that it needed to be based on the fingerprint system. Some people had other ideas about it, such as eye or facial recognition. These things can technically be done, but they can't run a check on somebody who committed murder somewhere and has a warrant out for their arrest and is fleeing the United States, because our basic law enforcement system only has certain data of people who are wanted for criminal activity. You need to use the fingerprint. It has been proven, it works, and it is used in every criminal justice system in the United States.

When he left office after going round and round about this subject, Secretary Ridge said: I have one bit of advice for my successors, and that is, use the fingerprint. I believe he was totally correct, and it still remains the only real system that will work.

Let's also be aware that numerous countries across the world—including New Zealand, Singapore, and Hong Kong—have been using biometric systems for years. This is nothing new. Others do it, and we can do it too.

Ending this failure has bipartisan support. My subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest, held a hearing on January 20 of this year entitled—I thought it was a pretty good title—"Why is the biometric exit tracking system still not in place?" That is a pretty good question. Well, during the hearing, we got promises from government officials, but there was no commitment that they would actually complete the system. They said: Oh, we are doing

pilot projects. We are considering this and working on it. Well, they have been working on it for 20 years. We had our members who were there—all three Democratic members who were at that subcommittee hearing said they favor this. There is no real opposition to it.

Just a few weeks after the hearing, Secretary Johnson of Homeland Security made public statements directing DHS to begin implementation of the system at our airports by 2018. To begin implementation when? In 2018. There was no promise that it would be completed, and there was no assurance that they were going to make the system a reality. This is at least an acknowledgement that it is needed, but we need a completion date.

It is these kinds of lulling comments that we have heard for years that have resulted in no action. If people in the Senate would like to know why the American people are not happy with the performance of Congress, this is a very good example. Congress promises to fix the problem, even claims we voted for and passed laws to fix a problem, and then it stands by while two decades go by and nothing happens. Why? Well, their special interests speak up. We have lobbyists sending out letters telling Members to oppose the Sessions amendment.

It is time for us to represent the national interest. The time for the special interests is over on this subject. Congress has spoken repeatedly. The American people are getting tired of this. I am getting tired of this. Who runs this place? Elected representatives or some high-paid lobbyist somewhere? They have been dragging this out and fighting it tenaciously with every effort they have had for years, and it has not happened and America is at risk because of it. Airports and airlines are happy to get Federal assistance whenever they can. They better be trying to cooperate and make their airlines even safer than they are today.

It is time to fulfill the promise and commitment we made to the American people. How much longer can this go on? We promised the American people a system that will demonstrably improve our national security. We voted for it time and again. We have bipartisan support for it. If we can get a vote on this amendment, we will see a huge bipartisan majority vote for it. I don't know who would vote against it. But we don't get to vote, and as a result nothing happens for years.

This was noted by the former Commissioners on the 9/11 Commission in a report issued in 2014:

Without exit-tracking, our government does not know when a foreign visitor admitted to the United States on a temporary basis has overstayed his or her admission. Had this system been in place on 9/11, we would have had a better chance of detecting the plotters before they struck.

That is why it is important. We have long known that visa overstays pose a serious national security risk. A number of the hijackers on September 11

overstayed their visas. The number of visa overstays implicated in terrorism since that date is certainly a significant number.

A new poll came out earlier this year that indicates that three out of four Americans not only want the Obama administration to find those aliens who overstay their visas but to also deport them.

Why not? They came here for a limited period of time. We have a law that says they can stay for a certain amount of time. It is not that hard to get a visa to the United States, but shouldn't they leave when their visa is up? Do they just get to stay here and take a job, perhaps from an unemployed American citizen?

The same poll indicates that 68 percent of Americans consider visa overstays as a "serious national security risk" and 31 percent consider visa overstays as a "very serious" national security risk. There is no doubt as to why.

The risk to our national security is too high for us to maintain the status quo. We must fulfill this promise. We must do everything we can to implement the system. I hope that some way, somehow, before this bill goes to final passage—dealing with airports and public safety issues—we fix this problem. Why not? I don't know a single person who opposes it, but we couldn't get the amendment up; we couldn't make it pending. The Democrats objected to it. Now we have an objection to having a vote on it before final passage of the legislation.

So I am frustrated. I have been pushing this for years. Even the Gang of 8 bill had it in there. So this is not something that I think is in any way unreasonable. It is time to bring it to a conclusion. I urge my colleagues: Let's figure out a way to make this happen.

I appreciate Senator THUNE, who is managing the bill. He is definitely for it and wants to see it happen. But right now we have objections from the Democratic side, and we don't seem to be able to get it through.

I urge my colleagues to reevaluate and approve passage of this amendment that should have virtually unanimous support in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the opening on the Supreme Court. Today I am going to focus my remarks on how important filling the current vacancy on the Supreme Court is for our system of governance.

When our Founding Fathers drafted the Constitution, they envisioned a system of governance upheld by three branches of government. The Federalist Papers outline this balance of power in detail. In Federalist Paper No. 51, James Madison spoke about the importance of checks and balances among three branches of government. As Madison stated: "It is . . . evident that the members of each department should be as little dependent as possible on those of the others." I don't think we always refer to ourselves as members of a department, but what he meant by this is that there are three departments in our government—the executive branch, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch. In Federalist Papers 78 and 80, Alexander Hamilton wrote about the important role of the Federal judiciary in particular. The writings of the Founders make clear that our democracy only works when all three branches are functioning.

In recent years, gridlock has hobbled the ability of the legislative branch to function. Although we have made some progress in starting to turn that around with the passage of the recent Transportation bill, the Education bill, and the budget, we also have had some very difficult times—fiscal cliff, the government shutdown. We cannot take that dysfunction to the third—as was called by James Madison—department of government, which is the judiciary. We cannot have a Supreme Court that doesn't function, which is exactly what is happening as some continue to obstruct the process, when all we want is a hearing.

We have already witnessed the Court split evenly without a ninth Justice to break the tie this year. These types of decisions can prevent the Court from responding to pressing issues in a timely fashion. In some decisions where there has been a 4-to-4 split, the result is effectively the same as if the Supreme Court never heard the case to begin with.

What if there was an emergency case like we had with *Bush v. Gore*? Again, do we want a 4-to-4 split in a case like that? Justice Kagan has said the current Justices on the Court are doing everything they can to avoid a 4-to-4 split, but that is not how it should work. Often these types of decisions provide less guidance to States, offering them less legal certainty.

Last week I held a meeting of the Steering and Outreach Committee, where I heard firsthand about what a serious issue this is for State and local governments. You have patchwork decisions across the country with perhaps 2 years that will go by before you have a High Court of the land that can decide which case and which decision rules when there is a split in the circuit. You can't continue to have a split on the Court.

As the former chief prosecutor from Minnesota's largest county, I know from my own experience how impor-

tant it is to have an ultimate arbiter to settle the law of the land. Cases challenging critical laws are now before the Supreme Court. We want those laws to rise or fall because the Supreme Court has decided the issue—not because of a 4-to-4 split, not because they were unable to do their job.

More split decisions are not the only risks we are facing. The current vacancy on the Supreme Court also has implications for the number of cases the Court is able to take in the first place.

In March of last year, the U.S. Supreme Court granted certiorari—that means they took the case—in eight cases. This year, it only did so for two cases. The current situation is compromising the integrity of our judiciary. If we allow the Supreme Court to become a casualty of the polarization in our politics, if we let politics impede the Court from having another Justice and from doing its job, people will lose confidence in the Court.

That is what sets our country apart. When you talk to companies across the world that want to invest in different countries, they look at the fact that we have a functioning judiciary.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, April 18, notwithstanding rule XXII, the Thune amendment No. 3680 be agreed to; the substitute amendment, as amended, No. 3679, be agreed to; and the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on H.R. 636.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, again I say to my colleagues that we made a lot of good headway on the FAA reauthorization bill. Throughout the day today—as we did quite late last night—we have attempted to negotiate a path forward to adopt more amendments. We have a package of amendments that have been cleared. A number of our colleagues wanted votes on their amendments, but there have been objections on both sides of the aisle which prevented us from getting to a final resolution.

This morning we adopted cloture on the substitute with a very big vote, but we still have to have a cloture vote on Monday on the underlying bill, which will occur at 5:30 p.m. So I am here to inform my colleagues that there will be no further rollcall votes during today's

session of the Senate and we will proceed with the cloture vote on the underlying bill at 5:30 p.m. on Monday. Shortly after that vote, I hope to get to final passage on the FAA reauthorization so we can move on to other business in the Senate.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Mr. KING pertaining to the introduction of S. 2800 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

NOMINATION OF MERRICK GARLAND

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I also want to address a second issue while I have the floor, and that is a conversation I had yesterday with Judge Merrick Garland. We had an opportunity to talk in my office for about 45 minutes to an hour. We talked about a wide range of topics: the limits on the President's Executive authority, how the Court should provide oversight to regulatory agencies, the Second Amendment, the role of stare decisis respect for precedence, general judicial philosophy. We talked about a number of issues, and I wanted to share with the Senate some observations from that meeting.

No. 1, the first thing I thought of last night after reflecting upon this conversation is that I used to be in the judge-appointing business. As Governor of Maine, I probably appointed 10 or 15 judges over my 8-year term, maybe more. I don't have a specific number, but I do recall the process which brought prospective judges in by a judicial selection committee, and then I would consider their qualifications and interview them in much the same way I did yesterday.

I always look for the same qualities: first, high intellect; knowledge of the law; nonpomposity—as a young lawyer, I didn't like pompous judges, and I don't like people who uphold themselves, particularly when they are in positions of authority, so a kind of modest demeanor; finally, a temperament whereby they can apply the law and make decisions without any dis-

cernible political or ideological bent. Indeed, as I thought back on the conversation I had with Judge Garland yesterday, I realized that he exactly fit that criteria. Were he an applicant or a candidate for the supreme court in the State of Maine and if I were the Governor, he would be the kind of guy I was looking for.

The other thing I reflected on as I was thinking about the conversation is that I wish the people of America had been looking over my shoulder and had heard the conversation, the questions, heard his answers, studied his body language and how he approached these questions, how his mind works, how he thinks.

I thought about the fact that many of us are having these meetings with the judge over these weeks, Members from both parties, and what we are doing is kind of a slow-motion hearing without the public being able to watch what is going on. I think that is where we are missing the boat on this nomination.

I fully understand the discretion every Senator has to make their own decision on whether this is a nomination that should go forward, but we are denying the American people the opportunity to participate in this process by not having a hearing and allowing them to see and hear and meet Judge Garland. I don't understand that.

Well, I guess I do understand the politics, and I will talk about that in a minute, but I don't understand why we are shutting the people out of this process, because if there was a hearing, it would probably go on for hours, there would be dozens of questions, the Senators could ask all the questions they wanted, and the public and the Senators would be able to observe this man and get a feel for who he is, what he would bring to this job, and the kind of person he is.

I have not made a final decision. If and when he is brought to the floor for a vote, I haven't yet decided how I will vote, although based upon my meeting yesterday and my knowledge of his prior judicial experience and his reputation, I am inclined to say yes. But I want to have a hearing. I want to see how he does in that hot seat where he is asked difficult questions by our colleagues. I want to see the reaction not only of the Senators but of the people of America as they have a chance to meet Judge Garland.

One of the things that concerns me about this process—and ironically Chief Justice Roberts commented on this just a few months ago, before the death of Justice Scalia—is the politicization of the Supreme Court. I am not naive, and I realize the Supreme Court makes important fundamental decisions. It is an important part of our governmental structure and makes far-reaching decisions that have effects on many people across the country. But I am afraid that today we have gotten to the point where the Supreme Court is treated as almost like a third

branch of Congress. It is another political body. Instead of being elected by the people, it is being elected by the Senators, and we are arguing about who gets to elect this so-called swing vote and which way the Court is going to be.

The Supreme Court should not be a political body, period. It should be a body made up of people—my impression of Judge Garland—who are servants of the law, who are students of the law, who are moderate and temperate.

I walked out of our meeting and I thought, this guy is a conservative with a small "c." He is a modest man with a deep knowledge of the law and a razor-sharp intellect but no political or ideological agenda that I could discern. I suspect that if and when—I believe it will ultimately be when—he is confirmed, he will turn into a Justice who will vote on one side of issues sometimes and make certain people happy and others unhappy at other times. I think he is going to be a straight-down-the-middle judge who calls it as he sees it, and I think that is exactly what we need on the Supreme Court today.

The other quality he has demonstrated as chief judge of the circuit court is the ability to bring consensus. By all reports of people who have worked with him—judges, people who have known him—he is a consensus builder. He is not a flamboyant, strong, charismatic kind of guy, but he brings people together. He marshals the court. He works toward unanimity. He is not a dissenter. He is not a firebrand. He is principled, but he is a consensus builder, and we definitely need that.

Five-to-four decisions, whichever way they go, in the long run are not good for the country, in my view, because they divide us and illegitimize the Court as a judicial arbiter of the Constitution as opposed to another political branch of our government.

So I believe what we should be doing is fulfilling our constitutional responsibility—not to vote yes, necessarily. The Constitution does not say the President shall nominate and we shall approve—but to consider and to advise and consent. That involves the simple matter of a hearing and would include the American people in the process.

There is a lot of discussion here of "let's hear from the American people." The way to hear from the American people is to have hearings, let them watch, let them take the measure of this person, and let us know how they think we should carry forth our constitutional responsibility in this case.

He appears to be—from what I know so far—an extraordinary candidate, not ideological, not partisan. I have no idea of his partisan background. I did not even ask him. It occurred to me afterward that perhaps I should have, but I didn't. I know he has worked in the Justice Department. He has been a prosecutor. He has been a private attorney, and he has been a very well respected judge.

I think he is a judge's judge, a lawyer's lawyer. That is the kind of person I think we need on the Court in this day and age. So I hope we can find a way to move to hearings, to allow the American people to participate in this process, to watch the process unfold, to get to know the judge. Let's get to know him better and then make our decision so we can carry out our constitutional responsibility to advise and consent.

That, I believe, is what we owe the Constitution and what we owe the people of the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

ISIS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss briefly the fight against ISIS and the sources of its financial support. As the administration accelerates the coalition military campaign against ISIS, I believe the administration must continue to intensify efforts to dismantle the financial networks that support this vicious terrorist organization.

We know that ISIS operates like a criminal syndicate and profits from the illicit sale of oil, antiquities, and other items through the black market, all while extorting civilians it has under its control. ISIS uses this funding to conduct terror attacks and control territory in both Iraq and Syria. They use it to buy more weapons, ammunition, and components for improvised explosive devices, which we know by the acronym IEDs.

They also use this funding to pay for salaries for fighters and to develop propaganda materials to spread their hateful ideology. Already, we have seen evidence that both U.S. and coalition efforts against their financial networks, including airstrikes on oil trucks and cash storage sites, have had a meaningful impact on their finances—the finances of ISIS.

There is evidence that ISIS has had to reduce the salaries they pay their fighters in recent months. That is good news. I believe that if we can cut off their money, we can significantly diminish their ability to operate. Members of Congress should support this effort in any way we can.

Recently, during the month of February, I traveled to four countries to focus on part of this effort. I visited Israel, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Qatar to press the foreign leaders in those countries, especially the last three, to accelerate the fight against terrorist financiers and facilitators.

Much more remains to be done to cut off the financing that ISIS receives. A recent report by the Culture Under Threat Task Force describes ISIS as

“industrial, methodical, and strictly controlled from the highest levels of the organization's leadership.” This report further indicates the analysts' warning that ISIS may try to increase its antiquities trafficking activity as other revenue streams such as oil sales are, in fact, cut off.

So we have to be on guard for this and take action against it. I sponsored the Senate version of the Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act of 2015. This is a bill that would restrict the importation into the United States of antiquities smuggled out of Syria since the beginning of the conflict. It also expresses the sense of Congress that the administration should better coordinate among the many agencies with expertise in counterterrorism finance and cultural heritage protection so there is better coordination within the administration. That is the aim of the legislation.

This bill also sends a strong signal that the United States will not be a market for this illicit activity that only benefits terrorists and especially ISIS. It also will not be a market that funds any terrorist group that leads to the destruction of cultural heritage. So I want to thank Senators PERDUE, GRASSLEY, COONS, and PETERS for their cosponsorship of this important legislation.

I am pleased that the Senate passed the Protect and Preserve International Cultural Property Act. It passed just last night. It is urgent that we send this bill to the President's desk.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAA REAUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to urge swift passage of the bipartisan Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 2016 currently pending in the Senate floor.

This legislation supports U.S. jobs and promotes competition while increasing safety in the national aerospace system. In the wake of the tragic attacks in Brussels, the bill includes a number of important airport security reforms.

We are proposing to invest in our Nation's airports by authorizing a \$400 million increase for the Airport Improvement Program, which airports across the Nation rely on to modernize their infrastructure. We are also seeking to preserve the Federal Contract Tower Program, which supports general aviation safety, commercial airports, law enforcement, and emergency medical operations.

Michigan is a large State, and our rural airports keep smaller commu-

nities across the Upper Peninsula and Northern Michigan competitive and connected. Maintaining the Essential Air Service Program supports airports that Michiganders rely on, such as the Alpena County Regional Airport, Muskegon County Airport, and Delta County Airport.

This bill also advances responsible usage of unmanned aircraft systems—known more commonly as UAS or drones—by addressing safety and privacy issues, enhancing enforcement against irresponsible usage, and creating new opportunities for research, development, and the testing of these innovative technologies.

I thank my colleagues—Commerce Committee Chairman JOHN THUNE and Ranking Member BILL NELSON—for working with me during the committee markup process to include a provision that grew out of bipartisan legislation I authored with Senator MORAN of Kansas—the Higher Education UAS Modernization Act. This important legislation will clear the way for our Nation's students and educators to use UAS technology for research, education, and job training. This will keep our research universities, workforce, and manufacturers on the cutting edge of global competitiveness as they develop the UAS of the future that will drive our economy forward. Our brightest minds will have the ability to design, to refine, and to fly UAS so they can advance these technologies to help prepare our country for safe, widespread integration of UAS into the National Airspace System. This will support job creation across the income spectrum as our Nation's workforce will be able to get the training they need to operate these systems both safely and efficiently.

This legislation has the support of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, the Association of American Universities, and dozens of other colleges and universities across this country.

In addition to advancing the next generation of civilian drone development, the reauthorization being considered also supports and protects the ability of our Air National Guard to safely and effectively operate remotely piloted aircraft, or RPAs.

I worked to include legislation that helps Air National Guard units across this country maintain their operations, including the Michigan Air National Guard's 110th Attack Wing in Battle Creek, MI, which I had the privilege of visiting earlier this month. The 110th has two critical missions: operating MQ-9 Reaper RPAs and a Cyber Operations Squadron.

Michigan is proud to host these cutting-edge, high-tech military operations that securely and effectively operate aircraft located thousands of miles away supporting our troops that are deployed overseas. Our troops have

a high demand for remotely piloted aircraft, which conduct intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance operations as well as offensive strike operations.

The Air Force is working hard to meet the demand for RPAs from commanders in theater and has already increased incentive pay for RPA pilots and doubled pilot class sizes to keep up with the demand.

Air National Guard units based in the United States but flying aircraft which could be anywhere else in the world add additional capacity to meet our global security needs. These are sensitive operations requiring very specific infrastructure that the Air National Guard has invested in at bases all across the country.

As certain Air National Guard units operating at civilian airports, like Battle Creek, transition from manned missions to remotely piloted aircraft missions, they are concerned the airport where they lease their base could be forced to either raise their rent or risk losing eligibility for much needed FAA grants. I worked with my colleagues—Senators COTTON and ERNST—on legislation to prevent this unfair and unnecessary choice for Battle Creek and other airports across the country. I am proud this provision has been included in the legislation we are considering today, which will prevent the FAA from denying grant funding on the basis that an airport renews a low-cost lease with a military unit, regardless of whether that unit operates aircraft physically stationed at the airport.

While I understand the FAA's interest in ensuring that airports receive a fair rate for the space they lease, I am glad this legislation will clarify that military units, including the National Guard, can continue to receive nominal leases. If an airport and a military unit agree to renew a low-cost lease, they should be able to proceed without concern the FAA will revoke the airport's grant authority.

The communities that host our military bases are proud of their role in national defense.

These airports shouldn't have to choose between continuing to host a military tenant and maintaining eligibility for grants that can improve the safety and efficiency of local airport operations.

Again, I want to applaud Leader McCONNELL, Leader REID, Chairman THUNE, and Ranking Member NELSON for their work on this important bipartisan legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage early next week.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. 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. CORNYN. Madam President, it may not look like it now, but we are actually making great progress in moving forward with a critical piece of legislation that would reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration and, in the process, make flying safer and more efficient for all of our citizens. Members across the aisle have worked together on this legislation, and I know we will have an important vote at 5:30 p.m. on Monday and hopefully be able to process some of the amendments that have been agreed upon by the managers of the bill, which are a part of the managers' package.

CALLING FOR APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL COUNSEL

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I want to turn to a topic that has concerned me a lot over the last year and troubles me more each day, and that is the use by former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton of an unsecured private email server while serving as our Nation's top diplomat. We have known about her private email server for a while now and the great lengths she has gone to avoid compliance with some pretty important laws that Congress has passed and that have been signed into law by the President of the United States.

I believe transparency in government is very important in terms of building public confidence for what we are actually doing. That is why even when I was at the State level as Texas Attorney General, I was an avid supporter of open records and open meetings legislation so the public had access and saw their right to know honored.

Here in Congress, since I have gotten here, I have been working closely with my ideological opposite, Senator PAT LEAHY from Vermont, with him on the left end of the spectrum and me on the right end of the spectrum, but both agreeing that the public's right to know is so important when it comes to self-government and what the public doesn't know can hurt them. That is why when Lyndon Johnson signed the Freedom of Information Act into law, it passed with such broad support, and it continues to enjoy that kind of broad support today. It applies the principle of transparency and accountability, and in the process, it helps build confidence for what Congress is doing on the people's behalf.

It is pretty clear that Secretary Clinton sought to evade those important laws by setting up this private email server.

I know most people are familiar with the dot-com domains that we use perhaps at your home or my home, and we have the dot-gov domain, which is used by government agencies and the like. But then there is a dot-mil, which is used by the Department of Defense and is a classified system. There is actually another system that operates independently which carries the most sensitive classified information circulated

by our intelligence community around the world.

Those are important distinctions because those don't necessarily talk to each other. In fact, they are not connected to the Internet. The classified intelligence system server is not connected to the military classified system or to the dot-gov system and certainly not to the dot-com or the private email server.

I have not heard another example of anybody who has been quite so careless—to use the President's term—or reckless—to use my term—with how private email servers are used to conduct official business. There is a lot of risk associated with that.

We know the former Secretary of State did delete tens of thousands of emails that were once on the server. In other words, she hadn't turned those over to the State Department to vet and determine whether they complied with court orders requiring the State Department to produce emails that were producible under the Freedom of Information Act. She just deleted them.

We know that her emails contained classified information, some at very high levels of government classification. As many of our Nation's top security experts will tell you, it is likely that our adversaries had easy access to and monitored Secretary Clinton's unsecured server, as well as the sensitive communications that were contained on it.

As Secretary of State, you are a member of the President's Cabinet. You are operating at the highest levels of classification with very sensitive information, and it is simply irresponsible to subject that information to the efforts by our Nation's adversaries to capture and read it and use it to their advantage.

All of this should concern all of us. I am not just talking about the political ramifications. This is not primarily about politics. But Secretary Clinton's actions were such an extreme breach of the Nation's confidence, and they potentially gave away extremely sensitive information that put our national security in jeopardy, not to mention the lives of those who serve our country in the intelligence community and whose very identity may have been revealed by this very sensitive classified information.

This is not a trivial matter. We need to treat this seriously, and the facts must be pursued in a thorough, impartial investigation. I know most people don't really believe there is such a thing as an impartial investigation here in Washington, DC, but there is a category of counsel that has been created by Congress to provide some measure of independence from the Department of Justice. That is called a special counsel. It is up to the Attorney General herself whether to appoint the special counsel when she recognizes

that there is an apparent conflict of interest or at least an appearance of partiality that ought to be dealt with by the appointment of a special counsel.

Given the unprecedented nature of this case and the unavoidable conflicts of interest, I strongly believe there is no other appropriate action for Attorney General Loretta Lynch to take than to appoint a special counsel in this case to get to the bottom of it, to follow the facts to wherever they may lead, and to make sure the law is applied impartially and fairly wherever those may fall.

The American people were reminded of the need for a special counsel last weekend when, once again, President Obama opined publicly about the investigation. In an interview on Sunday, President Obama dismissed the email scandal by splitting hairs about how the government classifies information. According to the President—get this—“there’s classified, and then there’s classified” information.

He was attempting to draw meaningless distinctions between levels of classification, suggesting that release or exposure of some classified information was OK as long as it wasn’t the “classified” information, which supposedly he would say should be kept from our Nation’s adversaries and kept confidential.

President Obama, in other words, was trying to indicate that even though classified information was on Secretary Clinton’s private server, he somehow divined that it was not so sensitive that it would put our country in jeopardy.

First of all, we know that some of Secretary Clinton’s emails were classified even beyond confidential, to the secret and top secret special access program levels—some of the highest levels of classification. Second, the President’s comments have to be confusing to many public servants around the country, who, as part of their daily work, handle classified information and the way they do it when they are issued a national security clearance or sign a nondisclosure agreement. According to the President, it must be OK to expose some classified information to public view but not others. I can guess that people who work in that world must be somewhat confused and perplexed by the President’s statement.

To dismissively talk about the different levels of classification is not only wrong but, frankly, it is insulting to Americans who work tirelessly on a daily basis to protect our national security and, in particular, to those who go to great lengths to properly and carefully handle classified information, even when it isn’t particularly convenient.

But perhaps worse, the President was opining publicly on the results of an ongoing criminal investigation over which it turns out he knows absolutely nothing—at least if you believe the key players in that investigation. Although

he claims to adhere to a strict line between himself and the investigation, President Obama repeatedly suggests his desired outcome and acts as if he is Secretary Clinton’s front line of defense.

Here is President Obama in the same interview. He said that he “continues to believe that [Secretary Clinton] has not jeopardized America’s national security.”

How in the world could the President possibly know that if, in fact, there is a strict line between himself and the investigation?

Attorney General Lynch has testified and stated in front of the Senate Judiciary Committee—and FBI Director Comey has likewise testified—that there has been no reporting to the White House about the results of the ongoing investigation. Everybody understands that would be improper, but somehow the President suggests it is all OK and that he knows, when, in fact, he doesn’t know.

How could the President possibly know that, especially when—as the President made clear last Sunday—he has not been “sorting through each and every aspect” of the issue? By the President’s own admission, he doesn’t talk to the Attorney General or the FBI Director about ongoing investigations, and he certainly isn’t conducting it, so he wouldn’t have personal knowledge. Under no circumstance is this kind of commentary by the President OK. There is simply no way to read this without running a serious risk of trying to influence the outcome of the investigation, which everybody should recognize would be completely improper. The President has done this before and so has his spokesman, the White House Press Secretary. Time and again the White House has projected its desired outcome in this investigation to the public and, worse, to those people conducting it. As I said, it is completely inappropriate, but don’t just take it from me.

As I mentioned a moment ago, last month the Judiciary Committee heard testimony from Attorney General Loretta Lynch. I conveyed to her at the time the need for a special counsel to investigate the case. At the hearing, Attorney General Lynch testified that it was her hope that everyone, including the White House, would stay silent when it comes to commenting on an ongoing investigation by the FBI.

I couldn’t agree with her more. The responsible thing for the President to do would be to say nothing, particularly if he knows nothing about the content of an ongoing criminal investigation. I wish the President would take the advice of his lawyer, the Attorney General of the United States, and respect her prerogative as the Nation’s chief law enforcement officer and the reputation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Director Comey made it clear that the FBI does not care for politics. It doesn’t play politics. In fact, the credibility and integ-

rity of the FBI depends upon their not playing politics. So why is the President playing politics with law enforcement?

Well, the threat of a President influencing an ongoing investigation intentionally or otherwise is not something we must just accept. What we need is an investigation that is as independent as possible.

I hope the Attorney General, in light of the President’s comments and his attempt to influence the investigation—I can think of no other reason he would say what he did—reconsiders her refusal to appoint a special counsel in this case. At the very least, I hope the President quits talking about a subject he knows nothing about, which is what the investigation is revealing, and let the Justice Department do its job without feeling the pressure that apparently the White House is attempting to impose on the FBI and the Department of Justice.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ZIKA VIRUS

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I am here today to talk about the Zika virus, which we have been hearing a lot about in the news lately. It is a virus that first began to appear—well, obviously it has been around for a long time, but we began to see it in the news lately with regard to its implications in Brazil and Latin America. But it has now found its way here to the United States, and there has been a lot of discussion about it.

As the Presiding Officer knows, the President has requested \$1.9 billion to deal with it. There are a lot of different things we need to do to address it. There has been a little bit of a squabble in the Congress about whether we should be spending that much money on it.

So one of the things I argued for—and it has happened—is that we should take some of the money that was set aside for Ebola when the Ebola crisis was going on—it was about \$500 million of that that had been unspent. I argued that before we go to the \$1.9 billion, there was \$500 million immediately available. Let’s assign that to be used. The President has agreed to do that. But there is still a shortfall on this issue. It does need to be addressed. I hope we can find a way to address it.

Obviously my political differences with the policies of the White House are well known and established, but this is an issue where I believe and I hope they will be supportive of this request.

To be abundantly clear, it is not just about throwing money at it. We have to make sure the money is being spent on the right things. This is not just saying “Here is \$1.9 billion” and throwing the money at Zika; you want to make sure, No. 1, it is all being spent on dealing with the virus. Oftentimes in this place, when money is assigned for a catastrophe or a disaster or anything like this, a breakout of a disease, suddenly you see all kinds of other ideas and programs attached to it that have nothing to do with the primary reason the money is being spent. So we want to make sure, No. 1, that if there is \$1.9 billion that is going to be spent on this, that all of it is spent on this and not on some other thing.

The second is, we want to make sure the money is being spent on the right things. What are the right things? Well, we have discussed those over the last few days. One of the most important things that need to happen long term is the money necessary for basic research to incentivize the vaccine. There is a belief that they can pretty quickly get to a vaccine that will protect people from this. That is important.

I think there needs to be thought put into the testing. Today, testing for the Zika virus is less than reliable. There is not a commercially available test. For example, in Florida, if you want to be tested for Zika, it has to be through the State department of health. You cannot go down to Quest Laboratory or one of the providers of lab tests and get it. There is not a commercially available test. So that has to be improved as well.

Those are the sorts of things I hope the money will be geared towards. This is why it is so important. I don’t want us to take our eyes off of this because if this issue really takes off on us here in the United States, we don’t want to say that we knew it was happening but we ignored it and did nothing about it.

On Monday of this week, there was a Reuter’s report in which U.S. officials warned that the Zika virus is “scarier” than they initially thought. The Zika virus is now present in about 30 States. And by the way, there are hundreds of thousands of infections that could appear in the territory of Puerto Rico.

Here is a quote from the Deputy Director of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention:

Everything we look at with this virus seems to be a bit scarier than we initially thought. And so while we absolutely hope we don’t see widespread local transmission in the Continental United States, we need the States to be ready for that.

As of now, from my understanding, there has only been one case of transmission in the continental United States. That happens to be in Polk County, FL. But there are dozens in the territory of Puerto Rico. So this is deeply concerning.

The other thing they found is that the mosquito species that primarily transmits the virus is present in about

30 States rather than 12, as previously thought. So that, too, indicates that this could be a very serious issue that could find itself in places outside of the tropical climates to which we once thought it was limited.

On Wednesday, the Centers for Disease Control—this was last Wednesday—the CDC said that it is now clear that Zika definitely causes severe birth defects. Confirming the worst fears of many pregnant women in the United States and Latin America, U.S. health officials said Wednesday that there is no longer any doubt that the Zika virus causes babies to be born with abnormally small heads and other severe brain defects.

This is something that now—looking at what has happened in Brazil and other parts of the country, there is now real concern about what this can mean for pregnant women and the ability to transmit that to their unborn child. The effects of it are devastating.

Initially it was thought that the Zika virus is very dangerous if you contract it in the first trimester but that after that the risk is no longer as grave. But on Thursday of this week, we got the news—this was reported in USA TODAY—that the Zika virus may, in fact, affect babies even in the later stages of pregnancy. The Zika virus may pose a threat to women and their fetuses even in the later stages of pregnancy, according to a study published online Wednesday in the BMJ, which was formerly known as the British Medical Journal.

Doctors initially suspected that Zika infections, which are largely spread by mosquitoes, would be most harmful to fetuses in the first trimester or the first 3 months of a 9-month pregnancy. In this study, however, 23 percent of the mothers of babies with microcephaly were infected with Zika in the second trimester. Two mothers were infected in the sixth month of pregnancy. None were infected in the third trimester.

The babies in the study had problems that went far beyond simply small heads. The brain damage seen in the study was “extremely severe, indicating a poor prognosis,” according to the study.

The authors of the report have now expanded the study to a total of 130 babies with microcephaly. Several infants have had epileptic seizures within 3 to 5 months after birth. The extent of the brain damage seen in the babies in the study, which was captured in MRI images, was “stunning,” according to James Bale, Jr., a professor of pediatric neurology at the University of Utah School of Medicine. This is the quote: “This is a really remarkable degree of damage.” Babies with this condition have severe microcephaly, extra scalp skin, intellectual disabilities, and prominent occipital bone, which is located at the back of the head, according to the CDC.

By the way, these fetal brain disruptions we have talked about are nor-

mally extremely rare. A 2001 review in a medical journal identified only 20 cases, according to the CDC. So this is something we are looking at that does not normally happen as a normal risk, but it is clearly being exacerbated by the Zika virus. In fact, in MRI images published by the BMJ study, one baby appears to have a very small, even non-existent brain. Judging by the damage on the MRI, the baby in that image is likely to have severe cognitive impairment and may be unable to learn to walk or talk.

So that is why the same day I sent a letter to the Centers for Disease Control. I sent a letter to them regarding the Zika testing backlog.

On April 8, I hosted a briefing in Miami—a week ago tomorrow. Some State health departments, local health departments, and county government officials were represented. I included health officers from Puerto Rico. I publicly, as I said at the time, offered my support for the President’s emergency supplemental funding request.

While I heard there were many obstacles that we face in fighting Zika, one aspect I heard about repeatedly was the distressing length of time it takes for diagnostic tests to be completed. I have subsequently seen media reports of pregnant women who have waited up to a month for the CDC to complete their diagnostic tests for the Zika virus while fearful mothers anxiously waited to know their child’s fate.

Of course, we are still waiting for the supplemental request to be passed, and I hope we can do that quickly. There really is no reason to wait on this.

But until Congress approves the request, I urge the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to use whatever steps are necessary to dedicate currently available resources to clearing its current backlog of Zika diagnostic tests and to prioritize these tests for women who are pregnant.

I believe these essential steps will help us not only to ease mothers’ minds who test negative for the virus but also to provide critical care for a child whose mother tests positive for the Zika virus. We know that screening for microcephaly should happen early and often, and receiving the results of a diagnostic test is the first step in that process. The CDC should have the capability to provide those services immediately to those who are waiting.

Ultimately, it is my hope that the U.S. Food and Drug Administration will approve a commercial Zika diagnostic test in the near future so that these tests are more broadly available.

One more thing that was reported on Wednesday was that the House GOP is readying a Zika funding plan. House leaders are working on approving more funding by the end of this year. Once again, I encourage them to do so in light of the circumstances we now face.

I am not saying this is going to be an outbreak of crisis proportions, but I am saying that for a family that is potentially impacted by this, it will be a crisis. I am saying that it is important for

these testing kits to be available—not only for the expectant mothers or potentially pregnant but also for men because, as we know, the Zika virus can also be transmitted sexually, as it was in the transmission that occurred in Polk County, FL.

Beyond it, I hope that in this funding request we don't wait until the end of the year. The summer months are coming, and these are the months where the spread of these mosquitoes—the two strains of the two types of species of mosquitoes that carry the virus—are going to be prevalent in many parts of the country. It is the time of year when many people find themselves outdoors exposed to these mosquitoes.

I hope the funding request can be in place and that we don't wait until the end of the year to deal with this. It shouldn't take this long. Look, I believe in limited government, but I do believe one of the obligations of a limited Federal Government is to protect our people from dangers, whether they be foreign enemies or the risk of disease outbreak.

I hope we will move forward on this endeavor because it is important. It is a proper function of government. We shouldn't be sitting here 6 months from now regretting that we didn't act sooner. I hope we will move promptly and quickly both in the House and then in the Senate to address this issue.

I also wish to say that I don't want to forget about Puerto Rico. Oftentimes people forget that Puerto Rico is the United States. The people who live there are U.S. citizens.

There is already a severe outbreak when it comes to Puerto Rico. They are already facing this crisis. So it is important. If this were one of the 50 States, they would have a Senator on the floor right now, maybe two, arguing on behalf of them. Obviously, Puerto Rico doesn't have a Senator elected from the island.

I stand here today on their behalf to argue that this is an important issue that needs to be addressed for the sake of our country, but most immediately for the sake of the territory of Puerto Rico. I hope we will move quickly to confront this issue and to solve it.

I close by saying one more thing. While government has an important role to play, ultimately we have a responsibility. If you are traveling to parts of this world where you might be exposed to the virus, you have an obligation to get tested to ensure that you are not going to be transmitting this to your partner.

As I argued last week at my press conference, if you are going to be outdoors, you have an obligation to use mosquito repellent to protect yourself and your family from being exposed to this, just the same way you would wear sunscreen. It is important for us more this summer than any other.

It is not only Zika that mosquitoes transmit. They transmit all kinds of other very serious illnesses. There is a level of personal responsibility here.

We talked about people not allowing bodies of water, whether it is undrained pools or puddles of water in your backyard. These mosquitoes can grow in water containers as small as the cap of a bottle of water. They don't need a lot of water in order to reproduce and grow. So there are things we need to do in our own lives to take personal responsibility for dealing with the Zika virus.

But there is a proper role for government, and I hope we will play it. We have an obligation to hold the government responsible to ensure that the money that is appropriated is just being spent on Zika and is being spent appropriately on things that work. We should be working with our local and State partners to ensure that we are funding the programs that work and need to be funded. But I think we need to get it done. I hope we can get it done here rather quickly because the summer is upon us. I don't think we want to be halfway through the summer and wake up to the news that hundreds and hundreds of Americans in multiple States have been infected and we did nothing. We will have to explain that to our constituents, and I am not sure we are going to have a good explanation if we don't have it.

With that, I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REFORMING THE H-1B VISA PROGRAM

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise to speak about H-1B visas, often called the high-skilled immigration visa. Every year, the U.S. Government issues 85,000 new H-1B visas, including 20,000 for workers with advanced degrees. This is in addition to hundreds of thousands of foreign workers already in the United States on H-1B visas.

Beginning on April 1, employers can submit petitions for new H-1B visas. Every year, within a few days, the government announces that it has received many more petitions for visas than the number of visas available.

The government then conducts a random lottery to decide which employers will receive the visas. Every year this leads to a hue and cry from our business community about the need to increase the annual cap for H-1B visas.

Like clockwork, this process played out last week, just as it does every year. Let's take a look at what happened.

When most people think of H-1B visas, they think of big tech companies like Microsoft, Google, and Apple hiring top-notch computer engineers, pay-

ing them top dollar to come in from overseas.

But here is the reality. In fact, the top recipients of H-1B visas are foreign companies that use loopholes in the law to displace qualified American workers and send American jobs offshore.

In 2013, outsourcing firms received more than 50 percent of the annual H-1B visa cap. Think about that. Over half of these H-1B visas, designed to bring skilled foreign workers into the United States, are being given to foreign outsourcing companies.

It sounds wrong; doesn't it?

In 2014, 15 of the top 20 H-1B employers used the H-1B visa primarily to offshore American jobs; that is, to take Americans, put them out of work, and have foreign workers take their jobs. These 15 firms gobbled up over 190,000 new H-1B visas over 10 years.

This is how it works. Foreign outsourcing companies import thousands of foreign guest workers using H-1B visas. These companies then cut deals with American companies to outsource American jobs and to move them offshore. The United States keeps them in the United States but with these foreign workers. The U.S. company gives their American workers notice that they will be fired. But before the American workers are laid off—listen to this—the American workers are forced to train the foreign guest workers who are going to take over their jobs.

After they are trained, the outsourcing company returns the foreign workers to their home country where—guess what—they compete with the United States.

Most of these foreign outsourcing companies are from India: Infosys, Tata, and Wipro. You may not recognize those names, but they are making billions of dollars using the H-1B visa to outsource American jobs and displace American workers.

A high-ranking Indian Government official even called the H-1B visa “the outsourcing visa.” The International Herald Tribune investigated these Indian companies, and this is what they concluded: “Rather than building a thriving community of experts and innovators in the United States, the Indian firms seek to funnel work—and expertise—away from the country.”

Congress intended the H-1B program to allow an employer to hire a skilled foreign worker in a specialized occupation when the American employer couldn't find an American worker with those skills and abilities.

We didn't create this program for foreign outsourcing firms to exploit the program and to bring foreign workers to our country to be trained by talented American workers in order to see their jobs shipped away.

So let's take an example. In the last year alone, media reports have documented the replacement of hundreds of American workers by these foreign outsourcing companies. Let me give an example close to home. Abbott Labs of

Illinois, headquartered near Chicago, signed a contract for information technology services with Wipro, one of the largest foreign outsourcing companies based in India and one of the top users of the H-1B visa program.

Here is how it worked: Approximately 150 U.S. employees at Abbott Labs in Illinois are going to lose their jobs. The workers being laid off have stellar experience—many of them have been at Abbott for years. They have the credentials, the performance reviews, and some have amazing work records spanning decades at Abbott Labs. I know from recent conversations with Abbott Labs employees that this layoff is taking its toll on the morale of their remaining workforce.

When I heard about these plans, I wrote to Miles White, the CEO of Abbott Labs. I urged him to reconsider this plan and to keep his American workers who have worked so hard for Abbott Labs for years. Well, I am sorry to report he responded to my letter and confirmed his company's plans to terminate these American workers.

I am very concerned about Abbott Labs because they have required the employees who are losing their jobs and being laid off to sign away their right to sue or even disparage the company if they want to receive any severance pay. As a result of this agreement, Congress and the American people are unable to hear directly from the employees who are affected by this decision at Abbott Labs—employees who are losing their jobs to Wipro, an Indian company that specializes in outsourcing American jobs. Abbott employees have told my staff they were concerned that even if they spoke with our office about what was happening at Abbott Labs, they could be placed in jeopardy.

Other companies that have signed contracts with foreign outsourcing companies to replace American workers have also forced their employees to sign these nondisparagement agreements. So we are in the dark about the human impact of these outsourcing arrangements on the Americans losing their jobs. What we do know is this: 150 skilled and experienced American workers will lose their jobs and have had to sign an agreement that they will not say anything negative about their current employer. If they do not comply with that, they do not get their severance pay.

I sent a followup letter to Mr. White today about the gag order he has forced on his employees. We should be able to hear firsthand from workers who are losing their jobs because of outsourcing as to just exactly what is happening to them.

Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY and I first introduced bipartisan legislation to reform the H-1B visa program in 2007—almost a decade ago. Our bill would end these abuses and protect American and foreign workers from exploitation. The outsourcing companies are worried about our legislation. For a long time,

CHUCK GRASSLEY and DICK DURBIN were on the front page of a lot of Indian newspapers. Listen to the corporate jargon Wipro uses to talk about our bill:

With the growth of offshore outsourcing receiving increasing political and media attention, there have been concerted efforts to enact new legislation to restrict offshore outsourcing. This may adversely impact our ability to do business in these jurisdictions and could adversely affect our revenues and operating profitability.

Let me be clear. My first obligation as a U.S. Senator is to protect American workers. If that adversely affects the profits of a foreign company that specializes in outsourcing American jobs, so be it.

In 2013 I joined the Gang of 8—Democrats and Republicans—and we put together a comprehensive immigration reform bill. Corporate interests fought hard to protect these H-1B visas, but we successfully included several important changes to the program in the bill. Let me give an example. Under current law, employers are permitted to pay H-1B visa holders substandard wages, which creates an incentive to fire Americans and hire foreign workers.

The vice president of Tata, out of India, one of the leading foreign outsourcing firms, candidly acknowledged they use H-1B visas to undercut American workers. Here is what he said:

Our wage per employee is 20-25 percent lesser than U.S. wage for a similar employee. . . . The issue is that of getting workers in the U.S. on wages far lower than local wage.

He was pretty candid about it. The object is to put Americans out of work and to charge less than what the Americans are being paid. So I wrote a provision in the 2013 comprehensive immigration reform bill that discouraged employers from hiring foreign workers as a source of cheap labor by doubling the minimum wage of H-1B employees, and employers of large numbers of H-1B visa holders would be required to pay, at a minimum, the average wage paid to an American. That is why the chief executive of Tata in India said our bill would have been "very tough" on outsourcing companies. So be it.

The Senate passed that bill on this floor 68 to 32. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives refused to even call the bill. They wouldn't debate it or call it for a vote.

Now, the two leading Republican Presidential candidates, Donald Trump and the junior Senator from Texas, have jumped on the bandwagon. They want to reform the H-1B program. Unfortunately, their track records call into question their real commitment. Mr. Trump owns companies that have sought to import at least 1,000 temporary guest workers while turning away hundreds of American workers. In 2013, when the Judiciary Committee considered the comprehensive immigration reform bill, Senator CRUZ of Texas offered an amendment to in-

crease—increase—the annual cap for H-1B visas to 325,000 per year—almost four times the current number.

Nonetheless, if they have changed their mind out on the campaign trail, we welcome that change of heart and welcome them to this debate. We must reform the H-1B visa program and fix other parts of our broken immigration system to protect American and immigrant workers. The solution is still comprehensive immigration reform. The time for action is now. Congress has avoided its responsibility for far too long.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORKING WITH OUR ALLIES

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I wish to spend a few minutes talking about our allies across the globe, and I am doing so because they are important to our national security. That seems to be an obvious statement, but our allies seem to be getting a bit of a bipartisan short shrift of late. I come to the floor of the Senate to talk about how important they are to our Nation, to our citizens. It is bipartisan, as I mentioned.

As many of us have read, on the campaign trail Presidential candidate Donald Trump has been critical of NATO, has been critical of our Asia-Pacific allies. Meanwhile—and in many ways it hasn't gotten the news it deserves because it is a sitting President—in a recent article in *The Atlantic* by Jeffrey Goldberg entitled "The Obama Doctrine," President Obama himself is dismissive of many U.S. allies around the world.

I thought it was important to talk a little bit about our allies and how important they are to U.S. security and to expanding American influence globally.

Let's start with Mr. Trump. He has called NATO—which, by the way, happens to be one of the most successful alliances in the history of the world—an alliance that is "obsolete" and "too expensive." About the members of the 28-nation alliance, he said: "Either they pay up, including for past deficiencies, or they have to get out. And if it breaks up NATO, it breaks up NATO." Oh, well. So much for the world's most successful alliance.

However, contrary to public perception, the United States does not pay for a majority of NATO's spending. We pay about 22 percent of NATO's common-funded budgets and programs for all of NATO—about 22 percent.

The Secretary General of NATO, Jens Stoltenberg, was here last week, and he

informed me and many of my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee that most NATO countries have stopped their decline in defense spending and have recommitted to NATO's goal of 2 percent of their GDP toward defense spending. That is important—working on the finances, reversing this trend. But here is the key point: It is not just about finances. Over 1,000 non-U.S. NATO troops have been killed in action in Afghanistan coming to our defense after 9/11, going after the terrorists who killed over 3,000 Americans on 9/11. Over 1,000 of our NATO allies have paid the ultimate price. You can't put a price tag on that. Thousands more have been wounded. Some sacrifices can't be measured in just dollars.

Based on his comments, Mr. Trump also does not seem to fully comprehend how the presence of American troops in the Asia-Pacific has been the linchpin of security and prosperity in the region for more than 70 years. Today our allies in the Asia-Pacific are substantially increasing their financial and military commitments in that region. Let me give a few examples.

Under Prime Minister Abe's leadership, Japan has amended its Constitution to do much more militarily in terms of being able to work with us and even defend U.S. forces in the region. As we are looking to rebalance and reposition U.S. forces in the Asia-Pacific over the next several years, the estimates from Pacific Command are that is going to cost about \$37 billion, repositioning U.S. forces in the Asia-Pacific. It is a very important part of our strategy. It is a strategy, by the way, that—the President talks about the rebalance, which I think is smart, in the Asia-Pacific. Of that \$37 billion for our forces and the military construction that is going to take place with this rebalance, about \$30 billion will be paid by Japan and Korea. That is certainly paying their way.

Let me give a couple of examples. Camp Humphreys—that is an Army base in Korea—we are moving a lot of forces there, doing a lot of military construction there, and it is going to cost about \$11 billion. Ninety-one percent of that is going to be paid by Korea—for U.S. military forces.

In Guam—U.S. territory where we are repositioning marines and other critical military assets in the Asia-Pacific—Japan is paying \$3 billion for that repositioning on U.S. territory. It is the first time ever. A foreign country is paying for military construction on our territory.

The bottom line is that there is no doubt that our allies around the world, particularly in Europe, need to do more in terms of defense spending. Many people have spoken on this. Former Secretary Gates—very well respected—raises this in his recent bio. But it is simply erroneous to suggest that America would be better off without NATO or without our Asia-Pacific allies and alliances. Yes, they need to

spend more, but there is a big difference saying we don't need our allies.

Let me say that we should all understand that Mr. Trump, Donald Trump—he is a candidate. He is certainly not an expert on national security affairs. And his views certainly reflect the frustrations that many Americans and many Members of Congress have about allies who are not spending as much on defense. Of course we know this often happens during elections. We have seen that. It is an outgrowth of frustrations.

But what is unprecedented is for a sitting President to be dismissive and even disdainful of our most important allies in a publication read by millions. To do so is not only unpresidential, it threatens to undermine ongoing U.S. national security interests.

I want to talk a little bit about The Atlantic article that I mentioned earlier, written by Jeffrey Goldberg. Mr. Goldberg, who had enormous access to the President for I think well over a year—traveled with him all over on Air Force One, had numerous interviews—in his article, he takes us on a trip across the globe through the eyes of President Obama. I would encourage all of my colleagues in this body to read that article.

As I mentioned, Mr. Goldberg has significant access to the President, but the tour across the world leaves us no doubt that the President not only views himself as the smartest man in the room, he is the smartest man in the world. In Mr. Goldberg's words, President Obama “has found world leadership wanting: global partners who often lack the vision and the will to spend political capital in pursuit of broad, progressive goals, and adversaries who are not, in his mind, as rational as he is.”

The President assesses the very strengths and weaknesses of our allies. In his view, only German Chancellor Angela Merkel measures up. There is a whole list of leaders from countries that are allies of the United States and are mentioned in this article. The President calls the President of a critical NATO country a “failure,” and he is openly disapproving of the leadership role of Britain and France and openly complaining that neither did their part with regard to Libya, where the Obama administration famously, or infamously, announced it was leading from behind.

The jabs and the stories in the Goldberg piece at other leaders, such as the leaders of Jordan, Israel, and Saudi Arabia, are gratuitous. These might be appropriate for later in the President's memoirs, as he is writing his memoirs talking about world leaders and where they measure up and where they are weak, but not while he is still the President. He still has work to do for our country.

The President even trains his fire on American leaders, members of the foreign policy establishment, and even GEN Lloyd Austin, the well-respected and recently retired commander of U.S.

Central Command. There is a big section in there about how the President viewed Ronald Reagan's leadership and shortcomings in foreign affairs. Everybody seems to be lacking in the President's eyes.

It is not just individuals, it is the way we, as a Nation, supposedly conduct our foreign policy. By the President's own account, he has been a bulwark against American hubris, self-righteousness—his words—in foreign affairs. Let me repeat that. His view is that he has been a bulwark against our hubris and our self-righteousness in foreign affairs.

As the Presiding Officer knows, whether it is Alaska or West Virginia, most Americans understand another more historically accurate narrative of our role in foreign affairs throughout the world. It is not one of hubris, but one of sacrifice, commitment, and courage in defending freedom for hundreds of millions of people across the globe. That has been the role of the United States, and for decades, especially since World War II, there has been a bipartisan, long-term effort by truly some of the smartest people in American foreign policy who were “present at the creation,” and beyond—as Dean Acheson said in his autobiography—into deepening our relationship with other countries and, as part of doing that, establishing the forward presence of U.S. military power around the world. These were some of America's best minds—Marshall, Acheson, George Schultz.

Why did they do this? Because forging these alliances ultimately not only advances the goal of freedom and a more peaceful and prosperous world, but it also helps ensure that American influence and power remain pre-eminent and, most importantly, that our citizens remain safe.

In assessing our significant international challenges right now, one central truth stands out: Many of our enemies and potential adversaries and rivals are ally poor while the United States is ally rich. Think of countries like Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and terrorist groups like ISIS. They have very few allies. Very few other countries are running to them right now. Then think about our allies throughout the world. It is time to recognize and double down on this uniquely American comparative advantage in foreign affairs. We are ally rich. Our rivals are ally poor. We need to take advantage of it. Yet the Obama administration seems to have ignored it.

Indeed, Secretary of State John Kerry has spent more time wooing adversaries like Iran and Russia than doing the hard work of deepening the bonds of trust with our allies. Coupled with the President's remarks in the Atlantic, his missives directed at friends make it seem as if they are actually repelling allies, not working with them and building up trust. This, of course, is a mistake.

Like many in this body, I have had the opportunity to serve my country in

different capacities, trying to work to advance the national security of our Nation. I have had the opportunity to see the positive results of the carefully woven fabric of decades of bipartisan American diplomacy, military engagement, and leadership throughout the world. Without American leaders who understand history and the important role our allies play in America's security and prosperity, the fabric of our alliances put together over decades threatens to unravel. If that happens, the world is going to become a much more dangerous place.

Our Founding Fathers provided the Senate with significant responsibility in terms of foreign affairs, and I am hopeful that every Member of this body will redouble their efforts to reach out and to work with our allies so we don't continue this trend where leaders currently in the White House, or perhaps potential occupants of the White House, view our allies as a burden when in reality they are a key component of our security and prosperity, and we need to continue to work with them.

I yield the floor.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the formal establishment of the Reserve Officer Training Corps, ROTC, at its birthplace, Norwich University in Vermont. Thanks to the vision of Alden Partridge and Norwich University, we now enjoy the benefits of this century-old program that has commissioned more than half a million ensigns and second lieutenants since its inception.

Years before many of his peers, Alden Partridge saw the potential of the citizen soldier. He created Norwich University as a place to educate future generations in a variety of academic fields separate from, but also essential to, the military and to the civic participation synonymous with today's Norwich University. Over the years, the value of the ideals promoted at Norwich University have remained clear to me. Today these proven ideals can be found at institutions of higher education through ROTC programs in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

Without question, the country benefits from this diversity of experience. The U.S. service academies create high-quality, professional officers, and I am proud to nominate Vermonters to them every year. Our military, however, cannot rely on leadership that comes solely from a handful of institutions, however excellent they are. For 100 years, ROTC has guaranteed an officer corps that better reflects the diversity of America.

Few schools can boast a history as long, rich, and relevant as Norwich University. Always forward thinking, in 1974, Norwich became one of the first

military colleges in the Nation to admit women, beginning yet another proud chapter in its history. Today the school ranks among the top institutions for education in the realm of cyber security, an essential professional discipline nurtured early on largely because of the forethought of Norwich University personnel. I am confident this trend of success will continue.

The faculty and staff at Norwich help produce highly motivated, well-trained graduates who are simply eager to serve. Their role as educators and mentors creates connections that last throughout the military and civilian careers of graduates and, in turn, fosters a powerful alumni connection that brings even more experience and wisdom to the next generation of students.

Vermonters take great pride in their educational institutions, and Norwich University is no exception. Students arrive from around the Nation to study in both corps of cadets and traditional capacities. They develop essential academic and professional skills often while simultaneously fulfilling ROTC obligations that prepare them for future military service. Norwich, like the 274 other institutions supporting ROTC programs, demands and develops excellence in its commissioning-track student body.

I would like to recognize Norwich University, the birthplace of the ROTC, for its role in initiating a program that has enjoyed a century of success. I am confident that Alden Partridge's dream will continue to be realized at colleges and universities throughout the Nation as future generations of ROTC officers are produced and charged with the task of ensuring our Nation's success.

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE EXECUTIVE SESSION ON INNOVATION AGENDA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at the Senate Health Committee's third executive session on its biomedical innovation agenda be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE EXECUTIVE SESSION ON INNOVATION AGENDA

This is our third and final markup of legislation that is part of our innovation, or "cures," agenda—that is, our effort to take advantage of this exciting time in science and enable safe treatments, drugs, and devices to reach patients more quickly.

Today's markup completes action on about 50 bipartisan proposals this committee has been working on for more than a year—with 10 hearings, five staff working groups that have held more than 100 meetings. When we are finished today, these proposals will together form a companion to 21st Century Cures Act, which passed the House 344–77 last year, and a vehicle for the president's Precision Medicine Initiative and Cancer Moonshot.

If we succeed, this will be the most important bill signed into law this year.

Why do I say that?

Here's one reason: 6-year-old Californian Rylie Rahall, diagnosed with a genetic disorder called Ataxia-Telangiectasia or A-T, so rare—according to NIH—that it affects between 1 out of 40,000 and 1 out of 100,000.

A bill we're voting on today will support the president's Precision Medicine Initiative to map 1 million genomes to help researchers tailor treatments to genetic variations and find cures for diseases, including rare diseases like A-T, and help children like Rylie.

Rylie's mom, Erica, says:

"At the time Rylie was diagnosed, I felt more helpless than hopeful. . . . There are no drugs. There is no cure. There is nothing to stop this disease and nothing you can do to save your child. . . . Five years later all of that is changing. There is more research than ever happening. We are closer than ever to clinical trials. . . . Hopeful."

Here's another reason:

In a floor speech in 2013, Senator Isakson talked about battling a superbug, an infection that runs out of control and resists treatment by common antibiotics. We are voting today on a bill by senators Hatch and Bennet to shorten the development of treatments for superbugs.

And another reason: A 2012 bill sponsored by Senators Burr, Bennet, and Hatch to expedite the FDA review process for breakthrough drugs has been very successful, leading to 118 drugs designated as breakthrough, including 39 approvals, including the first drug ever to actually cure some forms of Cystic Fibrosis. This committee passed similar legislation in March for breakthrough devices.

One more reason: we've heard from doctors that they spend half their time on paperwork, and from patients who lug boxes of medical records from appointment to appointment. This committee unanimously passed legislation to reduce the documentation burden and improve the flow of information so doctors can spend more time with patients, and patients can have easier access to their health information.

This committee has passed—by voice vote or with overwhelming support—14 bills made up of 30 bipartisan proposals; bills that will mean better pacemakers for Americans with heart conditions, better rehabilitation for stroke victims, more young researchers entering the medical field, and better access for doctors to their patients' medical records.

By the time we finish today, 16 of this committee's 22 members will have sponsored one of these bills. Some have sponsored several.

Today we are voting on five bills:

A bill by Senator Murray and myself to help the FDA and the NIH attract and retain top talent, which Dr. Collins and Dr. Califf say is their top priority.

The bill by Sens. Hatch and Bennet to shorten the development time for superbug treatments.

The bill by Senator Murray and myself to support the president's Precision Medicine Initiative, to map 1 million genomes and make the information available to researchers who will share their research.

A bill by Senator Collins, Kirk, Baldwin, Murray, and myself that requires NIH to submit a strategic plan to Congress; and ensures that scientists are including women and minorities in their research.

A bill by Senator Murray and myself to allow NIH researchers to spend more time finding lifesaving treatments and cures and less time on paperwork.

I look forward to moving these bills to the floor.

Senator Murray and I are making progress on an "NIH Innovation Fund" to provide a

one-time funding surge for NIH priorities including: Precision Medicine, Cancer Moonshot, the Brain Initiative, Young Investigator Corps, and Big Biothink Awards.

With its 21st Century Cures Act, the House voted 344 to 77 to provide \$8.8 billion in paid-for mandatory funding to support such NIH priorities. We continue working on finding an amount that the House will agree to and the president will sign that we can responsibly pay for in a bipartisan way. We have consulted with Senator Hatch, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. I discussed it with Senator Wyden in a meeting with Secretary Burwell. And I've talked with a number of committee members. I hope we'll be able to share an agreement with committee members soon.

I would like to take the proposals we've passed here, along with a bipartisan agreement on the NIH Innovation Fund with Senator Murray, and put them in Senator McConnell's hands as the Senate's contribution to a 21st Century Cures Act.

We'll have an opportunity for more debate on the floor, including:

On a proposal by Senators Kirk, Manchin, and Collins to create a first-time conditional approval for regenerative medicine treatments.

Improving monitoring of medical devices. Senator Murray strongly urged this and it is a top priority for Dr. Califf.

The issue of lab developed tests, which are vitally important to get right to ensure precision medicine and cancer moonshot are a success.

Last year, the most important bill signed into law fixed No Child Left Behind and affected 50 million children in 100,000 schools.

This year, I believe the most important bill will take advantage of this exciting time in science to improve the health of virtually every American.

The House of Representatives has done its job by a margin of 344 to 77.

The president has proposed his initiatives. I'm hopeful we can take this to the Senate floor, conference with the House, and send a bill to the president.

Sometimes we get caught up in bill numbers and sections, but as we finish our work, we ought to focus on people, like Rylie Rahall, or on Douglas Oliver, a Nashville resident who as recently as August was legally blind due to an incurable form of macular degeneration, but who, after participating in a clinical trial where doctors injected stem cells from his hip into his eye, now has perfect enough vision to read about what we're doing here in the HELP committee and sends us emails about his experience to help improve our work.

NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, this week we commemorate National Crime Victims' Rights Week, which began this past Sunday and concludes this Saturday, April 16, 2016. For the over 20 million people in the United States who become crime victims each year, this week offers an opportunity for Congress, the Department of Justice, as well as State and local law enforcement, communities, and service providers across the country to publicly proclaim our support for crime victims and survivors.

The physical, emotional, and psychological impact that crime causes for the victims and their loved ones can prove devastating. Crime wreaks havoc

on our communities. Given these hardships, we must do all we can to support and protect survivors by holding their perpetrators accountable and ensuring that all victims are treated with dignity, fairness, and respect. We can accomplish this aim, at least in part, by recognizing the critical position that victims hold within the criminal justice process.

The theme for this year's National Crime Victims' Rights Week is "Serving Victims; Building Trust; Restoring Hope." In keeping with that spirit, I want to recognize and thank the countless professional and volunteer victim advocates and service providers. Your dedication and commitment to our moms and dads, brothers and sisters, and daughters and sons, often during their time of greatest need, is truly profound. Thank you, thank you, for being that solid ground and strong shoulder supporting our fellow Americans as they fight for justice and to once again become whole.

To the millions of victims and survivors, you are not alone, and you have not been silenced. We hear you and pledge to do all we can to support you through your recovery. As the Senate Judiciary Committee continues to combat the scourge of crime through legislation and oversight, we will continue to both acknowledge and honor the needs and rights of victims and survivors.

HOW TRADE MADE AMERICA GREAT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, it was while a Yale undergraduate that Fred Smith received a C-plus for his paper outlining a plan to buy large airplanes that would carry packages overnight. This plan a few years later became Federal Express, now FedEx, a global courier delivery services company with nearly \$50 billion in revenues and more than 340,000 employees. FedEx has become a leading worldwide economic indicator all by itself and one of our country's great success stories. Mr. Smith not only founded the company, but today still is CEO and Chairman.

Fred Smith's address should be required reading on all college campuses, as well as for all others who may have forgotten the remarkable contribution trade has made to prosperity not only for our country, but for hundreds of millions worldwide. There is no doubt that globalization and technology have improved living conditions in our country, but they have also bred uncertainty and sometimes fear. For many Americans, the cheaper goods we buy from overseas and the salaries we make from selling goods overseas come with dislocations that make it harder for Americans to find jobs and provide for their families.

Added to that are actions by some of our trading partners—Japan in the 1980s and China more recently—that abuse the trade relationship and turn

free trade into unfair trade. Nevertheless, before we turn our backs on or significantly change our national policy of encouraging freer trade with other countries, we would be wise to read Mr. Smith's account of the benefits of trade to the average American family during the last 50 years—and also to be reminded of the devastation that restrictions on trade caused during the 1930s when those restrictions helped lead to the Great Depression.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Fred Smith from the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 25, 2016]

HOW TRADE MADE AMERICA GREAT

(By Frederick W. Smith)

During our years at Yale, the world was a different place. Foreign travel was exotic, expensive and rare among the population as a whole. While some young Americans had been abroad, by far most Americans had not—and those who did go abroad most likely traveled by sea rather than air. In the early 1960s, flying over the oceans was mainly for the affluent.

Long-distance telephone calls were expensive, international calls prohibitively so. From furniture to TVs and appliances, and especially automobiles, American brands dominated consumer spending in this country. We had just a glimpse of the world to come with the proliferating iconic Volkswagen Beetles and the amazingly small Sony portable transistor radios.

These imported products in the U.S. represented a global political vision that predated World War II. In the early 1930s, President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull believed in liberalized trade as a path to world peace and cooperation. With strong administration support, Congress in 1934 passed the Trade Agreement Act, which allowed Hull to negotiate reciprocal trade treaties with numerous countries, lowering tariffs and stimulating trade.

This liberalization reversed the epitome of U.S. protectionism, the disastrous Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, which contributed to a staggering 66% decline in world trade between 1929 and 1934. Integral to Hull's vision was the 1947 General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), which was signed by 23 countries and committed the U.S. to steadily liberalizing world trade. A central pillar of American postwar policy was enticing producers from around the world with access to the giant U.S. market.

The devastation of Europe and Japan and the emergence of Cold War adversaries provided even greater impetus to the opening of American markets, under the protection of the U.S. Navy and the umbrella of various global alliances like NATO. In April 1966 Malcolm McLean launched his first international Sea-Land container operation between New York and Rotterdam. McLean's shipping-container revolution cut the cost of seaborne trade by a factor of 50 versus loose-cargo stevedoring.

That same month, Juan Trippe (Yale '21) at Pan Am ordered 25 revolutionary jumbo 747 widebody Boeing airplanes equipped with equally leading-edge Pratt & Whitney high-bypass fanjets. When the passenger version of the 747 entered service in 1969, it was two-and-a-half times bigger than the Boeing 707 that had pioneered jet travel. The jumbo jet cut overseas travel costs by 70%.

The 747's hump allowed a freighter version to load cargo through a nose door under the cockpit and into the cavernous fuselage. Because of the cargo-carrying 747F, costs for trans-Pacific airfreight were dramatically reduced, a major factor in the extraordinary GDP growth of the Asian "tiger" economies of Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and Japan beginning in the 1970s. Electronics and other high-tech/high-value-added goods from these emerging markets could be distributed and sold in the U.S. and Europe in a few days—an amazing development.

During the 1970s and 1980s, while container ships and planes became increasingly efficient with each successive model, newly developed fiber-optic cables (patented in 1966) began running underseas, connecting the world at the speed of light, lowering voice and data-communication costs by orders of magnitude. Financial markets became globally integrated and transactions multiplied at an astounding rate.

The U.S. opened its markets to former World War II foes, and Germany and Japan as a result became economic titans. Successive administrations mostly ignored Japan's overt mercantilism and growing trade surplus, given the need for American military bases throughout the country. Eventually exchange rates and domestic political pressure pushed Japanese car makers to set up production plants in the U.S., mostly in the South. Electronics manufacturers such as Panasonic, Sony and Hitachi became worldwide giants on the back of exports from Japan to America and then almost everywhere as global trade steadily expanded.

Parallel to the technological progress of transportation and telecommunications was a remarkable series of congressional actions and GATT agreements that substantially liberalized transport and trade regulations. During the Carter administration, inspired by extensive academic research and the example of ultra-low-fare intrastate airlines in Texas and California compared with high-cost national carriers, many Republican and Democratic lawmakers alike pushed for federal economic deregulation of transportation. The Republican mantra was "free market"; Democrats sought "consumer benefit" by lowering the price of travel and goods for the masses.

As a result, legislation was enacted for air cargo (1977), passenger air services (1978), interstate truck and rail transportation (1980), and the federal pre-emption of intrastate trucking in 1994. Both the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) and the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), the air and surface economic regulators, were abolished, in 1985 and 1995 respectively.

In the 10 years following the Staggers Act of 1980 that substantially deregulated railroads, the perennially loss-making rail industry was able to halve the rates charged to customers while restoring financial stability. Surface-transport deregulation also spawned an entire new industry of flexible truckload common carriers to meet the needs of emerging "big box" distribution and retailing models such as Wal-Mart and Target. Revolutionary production systems, based on just-in-time supply and fast-cycle manufacturing, were made possible only because of the deregulation of trucking.

From 1977 to 1994, a century's worth of heavy regulation of transportation rates, routes and services that had begun with the railroads was cast aside, with profound effects on the U.S. economy. By the beginning of the 21st century, overall logistics costs were reduced from 16% of GDP during the 1970s to under 9%, thereby making possible substantial increases in government social spending resulting from the Medicare and Medicaid legislation in the 1960s.

On the global-trade front, the GATT framework of 1947 had been "temporary," as Congress refused to approve the International Trade Organization envisioned by the participants at the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference that established the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Even so, under GATT there were seven successive negotiating "rounds" and agreements until the World Trade Organization (WTO), a modernized International Trade Organization, was finally established in Geneva in 1994.

The GATT/WTO did not cover sea trade, given the traditionally liberal rules regarding shipping except within national regulated waters. Thus unimpeded, containership lines of many registrations proliferated, facilitating the astonishing growth in maritime business and the development of megaports in Asia, Europe and the U.S.

International aviation was likewise a separate regime, but as agreed by 54 nations at the Chicago convention of 1944, international flying was for decades tightly controlled by governments through a labyrinth of bilateral treaties (4,000 at present) that limited competition and regulated rates and services.

Beginning in 1992, however, the U.S. and the Netherlands enacted the first of many Open Skies agreements, which have grown now to 117, including a multilateral treaty with 28 European countries. Passenger airlines opened scores of new routes. New air-cargo and door-to-door express services were also initiated.

Together, these regulatory changes and transport innovations made possible the fantastic growth of travel and trade, which grew two-and-a-half times the rate of world GDP for a quarter-century.

From less than \$50 billion in total trade in 1966, the U.S. now imports and exports over \$4 trillion annually in goods and services. Container ships have grown from carrying a few hundred boxes on each trip to the new Triple-E behemoths that transport over 18,000 containers called TEUs, or 20-foot-equivalent units. The cost is 1/500th of the shipping rates per pound of the early 1960s. The profusion of agricultural products from the "Green Revolution" pioneered by Norman Borlaug, combined with ever more efficient shipping, has resulted in massive amounts of grain traded around the world, something unimaginable to farmers 50 years ago. American railroads were integral to the growth in the nation's maritime trade by moving containers from Pacific ports to the mega markets in the East.

All of these factors have created a global trade market that exceeds \$15 trillion annually. Now, the Panama Canal is being widened, which will permit, beginning later this year, massive container ships to cross the Pacific and unload directly into improved Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Coast ports, further reducing the cost of Asia-U.S. trade.

Handling the enormous increase in financial transactions was made possible by a fantastic increase in computer-processing power. The emergence of the Internet in 1994 has allowed the ubiquitous offering of millions of products for fast delivery from anywhere in the world to anyone with a desktop computer . . . then a PC . . . then a tablet . . . and now a smartphone. Languages are translated; products can be instantly, visually displayed; and orders effortlessly entered. The capabilities are unprecedented in the history of commerce.

Three other factors central to the development of these enormous global commercial systems have occurred since 1966: The evolution of a vast world-wide oil market; the integration of the economies of the U.S., Mexico and Canada with the North American Free Trade Agreement (Nafta) of 1994; and the emergence of China as a great commercial power.

The oil cartel known as the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries overplayed its hand in the 1970s when, for economic and political reasons, OPEC embargoed shipments to the U.S. Market forces finally sorted out oil supply and demand in America after President Reagan in 1981 dismantled the vestiges of government regulation in the industry. Oil has hardly been immune to the vagaries of any commodities market, but the U.S.—thanks to the technological breakthrough of hydraulic fracturing—is the world's largest producer of natural gas and is on track this decade to surpass Saudi Arabia and Russia as the world's largest oil producer.

True to the central tenet of FDR and Secretary of State Hull that liberalizing trade is inherently beneficial, the U.S. led the effort for China to join the WTO in 2000. Beginning with the Nixon-to-China rapprochement, the industrialization of America's Cold War enemy has lifted more people—hundreds of millions—out of poverty, faster, than ever in history. From the late 1980s and accelerating after the WTO accession, efficient Chinese manufacturing, especially technology-based goods, has rewarded Western consumers with low-cost products that have substantially improved standards of living. Americans and Europeans don't need to be affluent to afford cellphones, digital TVs, furniture and appliances.

China, however, has followed Japan's mercantilistic practices, which have led to a \$300 billion trade surplus with the U.S., thanks to state support of Chinese industry and restrictions on foreign competitors. These policies have created a strong political backlash in the U.S., which made the recent congressional renewal of Trade Promotion Authority—which allows the president to negotiate trade treaties and was for years a routine process—extremely difficult.

Today, given low growth in most of the world, rising wages in China and petroleum costs declining because of U.S. fracking technology, the trajectory of the world's commerce is somewhat uncertain.

Trade and global GDP are now growing roughly at parity. Following the 2008 financial crisis, protectionism has shown a troubling popularity in many countries, including the U.S. Stringent new security regulations have also slowed goods crossing many borders.

The Nafta pact has clearly been an economic success. Over the past 20 years, U.S. trade with Mexico and Canada has risen to \$1.2 trillion in 2014, from \$737 billion. While the immigration issue often gets erroneously conflated with Nafta, the economic numbers tell a clear story. Moreover, some production is now moving back to North America from Asia, given lower transport costs, faster delivery, the increase in Chinese production expenses, easier customs clearance, and the more balanced nature of Nafta trade compared with the massive U.S. deficit with Asia—particularly China and Japan.

Once again, in its own messy, unpredictable political fashion, the U.S.—after a hiatus during the first Obama administration—is pushing for further trade liberalization, with initiatives such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, and the Trade in Services Agreement. The WTO likewise continues to push for a new Trade Facilitation Agreement dealing with security and customs issues; the WTO Information Technology Agreement; and a new overall world-wide trade agreement—the so-called Doha Round negotiations. These efforts by many nations under the WTO show continued commitment to further global integration despite the well-publicized difficulties in doing so.

More than three billion people are now connected to the Internet. Billions more have aspirations for a better life and are likely to come online as global consumers. The odds are good, therefore, that today's remarkable transport systems and technologies will continue to improve and facilitate an even larger global economy as individual trade is becoming almost "frictionless."

History shows that trade made easy, affordable and fast—political obstacles notwithstanding—always begets more trade, more jobs, more prosperity. From clipper ships to the computer age, despite economic cycles, conflict and shifting demographics, humans have demonstrated an innate desire to travel and trade. Given this, the future is unlikely to diverge from the arc of the past.

74TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DOOLITTLE RAID

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I would like to recognize the 74th anniversary of the Doolittle Raid.

Following Japan's deliberate attack on Naval Station Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the United States was looking for a way to retaliate and boost morale. General Henry Arnold, the chief of the Army Air Corps, and U.S. Navy ADM Ernest King, the Navy Chief of Operations, were tasked with organizing a raid on mainland Japan that would act as the United States' return salvo. They needed an extraordinary airman and leader to execute the raid, and they found one in Army Air Corps Lieutenant Colonel James "Jimmy" Doolittle, a well-respected pilot who they believed could inspire his fellow airmen as they carried out this dangerous mission.

Doolittle immediately began selecting crew members for the mission, eventually recruiting 80 flyers who would later be nicknamed the Doolittle Raiders. The Raiders volunteered without knowing any specifics of the mission, but they trusted Doolittle enough that they were willing to follow him anyway.

The geographic isolation of the Japanese mainland posed numerous logistical challenges while planning the raid. Doolittle decided to use B-25 bombers launched from the U.S.S. *Hornet*, which would be positioned about 500 miles away from Japan. The B-25 bombers were an inspired choice, as they were mid-range bombers that were not normally launched from the decks of aircraft carriers and had limited fuel reserves. Despite these risks and the unprecedented nature of the raid, the Raiders began their mission.

On April 18, 1942, the task force was spotted by the Japanese, nearly 200 miles from the planned launch point. All 16 B-25 bombers were able to launch from the deck of the U.S.S. *Hornet*, but they lacked the time or fuel necessary to enter into formation, necessitating individual strikes that caused only minor military and industrial damage to Japan. All but one of the B-25 bombers made crash landings or had their crews bail out. The remaining plane made an emergency landing in Russia,

and the crew was interned. Eight soldiers were captured by the Japanese in China, three of whom were executed. Still, the Doolittle Raid was the first successful attack on the Japanese mainland in over 700 years, and it shook the confidence of their military.

The Doolittle Raid changed the course of the war, and the courage and bravery of the Doolittle Raiders is inspiring, even after 74 years. Three of the squadrons that participated in the Doolittle Raid, the 34th, 37th, and 432nd squadrons, are now stationed in Ellsworth Air Force Base near Rapid City, SD. I am proud to have squadrons with such a historic legacy stationed in my State, and I know that the example of the Doolittle Raiders will continue to inspire airmen everywhere.

PACIFIC TSUNAMI MUSEUM COMMEMORATION OF THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 1946 TSUNAMI IN HAWAII

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, this year marks the 70th anniversary of the 1946 tsunami disaster in Hawaii. Early on the morning of April 1, 1946, an undersea 8.1-magnitude earthquake off the Alaskan coast triggered a tragic event 5 hours and 2,400 miles away. Travelling at nearly 500 miles per hour, a succession of tsunami waves hit the Hawaiian Islands around breakfast time, devastating downtown Hilo on Hawaii Island and killing 96 people. Across the Hawaiian island chain, 159 people lost their lives to the tsunami.

In response to this disaster, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration established the Tsunami Warning System in 1948. Despite the system's proven effectiveness during two subsequent but minor tsunami events, another massive tsunami wave on May 23, 1960, took the lives of 61 Hilo residents. Many of the victims failed to take the warnings seriously or returned to their homes before the danger had passed. Another contributing factor was uninformed city planning that allowed residents to rebuild homes and businesses in tsunami risk zones. Shinmachi, a district in downtown Hilo rebuilt after the 1946 tsunami, was destroyed again by the 1960 tsunami.

While sobering, these tragedies are critical teaching opportunities. Decades after the disasters at Hilo, Dr. Walter Dudley and Jeanne Branch Johnston, a tsunami researcher and a tsunami survivor, respectively, envisioned a place where the public could remember and learn from these tragedies. Without sustained collective memory of the risk posed by tsunamis and complementary public outreach, they believed the tremendous progress in tsunami research and warning systems in the last half century would not prevent future disasters. After all, an unheeded warning is no warning at all.

Since opening its doors in 1994, the Pacific Tsunami Museum, PTM, in Hilo has demonstrated its ability to catalyze public engagement with tsunami

risk. Museum exhibits include the history of tsunamis in Hawaii and how past events have shaped the community and impacted long-range planning. The museum places strong emphasis on the human component of the tsunami story, the resiliency of a community that survived the disasters and also pays tribute to the victims. PTM also features exhibits on major tsunami events around the globe and frequently collaborates with sister institutions as far away as Sri Lanka. As part of its public outreach efforts, the museum has developed tsunami curricula and evacuation plans for schools, created publications on tsunami safety, and presented workshops and lectures on the issue both in Hawaii and abroad.

April is Tsunami Awareness Month in Hawaii. On April 16, PTM will host a special open house commemorating the 70th anniversary of the 1946 tsunami. This event seeks to promote awareness of tsunami risk, educate the public on appropriate responses to a tsunami warning, and honor the victims of Hilo's tsunami disasters.

The need to continually cultivate community resilience to tsunami events inspired me to push for stronger Federal support for essential detection, forecast, warning, research, and preparedness programs. My colleagues, Senators MARIA CANTWELL of Washington and DAN SULLIVAN of Alaska, and I introduced the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2015. If signed into law, this bill would reinforce and amplify the great work being done by PTM.

I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the tragic loss of life at Hilo in 1946 and 1960 and commending the Pacific Tsunami Museum for its tireless work to keep the public safe from tsunamis.

REMEMBERING CLIFF YOUNG

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, today I wish to remember a former Nevada Supreme Court justice, Congressman, and State senator, C. Clifton "Cliff" Young, a true Nevada statesman and dedicated public servant. I send my condolences and prayers to his wife, four children, nine grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren during this difficult time. Although he will be sorely missed, his legendary influence throughout the Silver State will continue on.

Justice Young was born in 1922 in Lovelock and earned his degree from the University of Nevada, Reno in 1943. He later served in the U.S. Army in Europe during World War II, earning the rank of major. As one of our Nation's servicemembers, he made exceptional sacrifices for our country and deserves our deepest gratitude. His service to his country, as well as his bravery and dedication to his family and community, earn him a place in history among the many outstanding men and women who have contributed to our Nation and the Silver State.

Following his time in the U.S. Army, Justice Young earned his law degree from Harvard Law School. In 1952, he was elected to represent the State of Nevada in the U.S. Congress, where he served two terms. From 1966 to 1980, Justice Young continued his public service as a State Senator in the Nevada State Senate. He then served for 18 years on the Nevada Supreme Court, where he served as chief justice twice, and retired in 2002. Throughout his tenure, Justice Young was inducted into the Nevada Legislature's Hall of Fame and was honored with the Federal courthouse in Reno being named after him. With his passing, Nevada lost a great man who is immortalized for his service to our Nation and the Nevada community. I extend my deepest gratitude for all of his work on behalf of our State. His years of service will be remembered for generations to come.

For over half a century, Justice Young demonstrated only the highest level of excellence and dedication while serving in the U.S. Congress, Nevada State Senate, and on the Nevada Supreme Court. Our State is fortunate to have had a public servant of such commitment and unwavering devotion, and I am deeply appreciative of his hard work and invaluable contributions to our State. Today, I join citizens across the Silver State in celebrating the life of an upstanding Nevadan, Justice Cliff Young.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GREG THAYER

• Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I wish to recognize Greg Thayer, CEO of Montana Milling, Inc., who was named the 2016 Montana Small Business Administration's Small Business Person of the Year. Montana Milling is a family-owned business that specializes in providing quality agricultural products to its customers. They are the No. 1 buyer of organic grains produced in Montana. The cleaning system and the milling process that they employ ensures that their products meet the highest quality standards.

Montana Milling under Greg's leadership epitomizes the Montana way of doing business, which is evident by their motto "Quality and service is our commitment . . . We guarantee it." I believe it is this dedication to customer service that led to Greg's selection as being chosen as Small Business Person for the Year. This award is a great testament to Greg's commitment to provide the best possible service to not only his producers, but for over 200 customers throughout the United States and Canada.

It is truly an honor to recognize Greg for this achievement.●

TRIBUTE TO SHIRLEY BECK AND DALE SIEGFORD

• Mr. DAINES. Madam President, today I wish to recognize the owners of

a great candy shop in the eastern part of Montana. Shirley Beck and Dale Siegford have own and operated the Sweet Palace located in Philipsburg, MT, since 1998, contributing to many Montanans' sweet tooth.

Shirley, a wife of a rancher, mother of three, and a former special education teacher, started selling Montana jewelry at the Gem Mountain Shop in 1988. Shirley had a great aptitude for assisting the customers in their search for the perfect piece of sapphire jewelry.

Dale, a Missoula, MT, native, began digging for Montana sapphires on Gem Mountain in 1987. Dale became an expert in the art of heat treatment, enhancing the colors of the Montana sapphires, especially pink and yellow.

Together at Gem Mountain, they became a great team and moved on to opening their own shop, the Sapphire Gallery, in 1992. The Sapphire Gallery became a flourishing business and inspired the duo to open the Sweet Palace right next door, the start of a great business partnership, prompting Shirley and Dale to open another store.

It is impressive that two people can go from making jewelry to making candy in our great State. Philipsburg is a beautiful town near the Sapphire Mountains, and through their businesses, they make it even greater.

Thank you, Shirley and Dale, for helping keep Montana alive.●

TRIBUTE TO STACIE MATHEWSON

• Mr. HELLER. Madam President, today I wish to recognize an individual who has gone above and beyond in her endeavors to help fellow Nevadans and Americans across the country, Stacie Mathewson. This ambitious Nevadan founded the Stacie Mathewson Foundation and Transforming Youth Recovery, which promote drug addiction awareness, recovery, prevention, and education throughout our State and country. Her work is truly invaluable to Nevada, helping to break the cycle of drug abuse within our community.

Mrs. Mathewson's unwavering dedication to transform youth recovery began in 2011 when she founded the Stacie Mathewson Foundation, an organization committed to improving addiction recovery and prevention, while eradicating the social stigma involved with substance disorder. In that same year, the foundation helped fund the Nevada Recovery and Prevention Program at the University of Nevada, Reno, UNR. The on-campus program has implemented various recovery groups, in addition to providing supportive gathering places for students who choose sobriety. Mrs. Mathewson also spearheaded the creation of a national sobriety program for college campuses, which has been successful at 150 colleges and universities across the country.

Mrs. Mathewson's work has also more narrowly focused on helping the youth in our great State. In May of

2015, the Youth Offender Drug Court was established, working to provide an alternative treatment for those in need. With help from Transforming Youth Recovery, the Josh Montoya House was created and serves as a facility for the Washoe County Youth Offender Drug Court in order to provide young men who are combating drug addiction with comprehensive residential and outpatient treatment care.

Mrs. Mathewson has focused on growing early prevention within the local community as well. On February 1, 2016, Mrs. Mathewson announced Transforming Youth Recovery's commitment to launching an innovative research program, Doors to Recovery, for students from kindergarten through 12th grade in the Washoe County School District. The program aims to create a comprehensive prevention and intervention program, as well as recovery support services for students and families. Mrs. Mathewson stands as a role model, demonstrating genuine concern and understanding of others who are in need. I am thankful to have her working as an ally to address this national epidemic.

Today I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing Mrs. Mathewson for all of her hard work in bringing greater awareness to drug addiction and in transforming youth recovery in the State of Nevada and across the Nation. I am honored to call her a fellow Nevadan and a friend, and I wish her all of the best of luck as she continues in her endeavors with the Stacie Mathewson Foundation.●

RECOGNIZING TRIANGLE COOPERATIVE SERVICE COMPANY

• Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, today I wish to highlight the 100-year history of the Triangle Cooperative Service Company of Enid, OK. This year, 2016, is their 100th year in business in Oklahoma, and I am pleased to highlight them on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Triangle Cooperative Service Company was founded in 1916 by 20 local Oklahoma cooperatives to ensure rural Oklahomans could get their grain products to market at a fair price via rail. Soon, they grew their business to support Oklahomans in other ways, including helping conduct grain audits and by providing accounting services.

In 1929, it was decided that Triangle Cooperative Service Company would continue to offer member services to the local cooperatives, while a separate entity would be the official Grain Sales Agency for both Oklahoma and Texas. During the 1930s and the 1940s, a large number of grain facilities and cotton gins were built throughout Oklahoma. These new facilities created an increased demand for insurance to protect Oklahoma's farming communities from drought, natural disasters, and other severe weather events. In 1932, TCSC Insurance Agency was formed and molded the future of the Triangle

organization. The Triangle Insurance Company was chartered on January 3, 1992, officially becoming a licensed property and casualty insurance company within the State of Oklahoma.

In 1996, the memberships of Triangle Cooperative Service Company and Producers Exchange Cooperative voted to merge the two cooperatives. This decision to merge marked the beginning of Triangle's expansion. Today, Triangle Cooperative Service Company has grown to 125 employees and over 300 members throughout 20 Midwestern States, continuing to spread its proud tradition of quality service.

In addition to the insurance agency and insurance company, Triangle Cooperative Service Company offers its member cooperatives employee group benefits, HR solutions and safety, and compliance management. Today, the Triangle Cooperative Service Company is cooperatively owned and governed by a board of directors and Mr. John Berg serves as president and CEO.

I am pleased to highlight the history and journey of the Triangle Cooperative Service Company as part of their 100-year history today.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:37 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3586. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve border and maritime security coordination in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4403. An act to authorize the development of open-source software based on certain systems of the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State to facilitate the vetting of travelers against terrorist watchlists and law enforcement databases, enhance border management, and improve targeting and analysis, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4482. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a southwest border threat analysis, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4509. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to clarify membership of State planning committees or urban area

working groups for the Homeland Security Grant Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4549. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to conduct security screening at certain airports, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:44 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 483. An act to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 2512. An act to expand the tropical disease product priority review voucher program to encourage treatments for Zika virus.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3586. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve border and maritime security coordination in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4403. An act to authorize the development of open-source software based on certain systems of the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State to facilitate the vetting of travelers against terrorist watchlists and law enforcement databases, enhance border management, and improve targeting and analysis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 4482. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a southwest border threat analysis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4509. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to clarify membership of State planning committees or urban area working groups for the Homeland Security Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4549. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to conduct security screening at certain airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 14, 2016, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 483. An act to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 2512. An act to expand the tropical disease product priority review voucher program to encourage treatments for Zika virus.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 2804. An original bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-236).

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2390. A bill to provide adequate protections for whistleblowers at the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

S. 2613. A bill to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2614. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, to reauthorize the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program, and to promote initiatives that will reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Clare E. Connors, of Hawaii, to be United States District Judge for the District of Hawaii.

(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. MENENDEZ (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. REID, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2799. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary patient registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide an exclusion from income for student loan forgiveness for students who have died or become disabled; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 2801. A bill for the relief of Malachy McAllister, Nicola McAllister, and Sean Ryan McAllister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2802. A bill to provide adequate protections for gun owners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 2803. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to deposit certain funds into the general fund of the Treasury in accordance with provisions of Federal law with regard to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act's Transitional Reinsurance Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 2804. An original bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2805. A bill to modify the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 425. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Public Health Week; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. MIKULSKI, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BROWN):

S. Res. 426. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should support and protect the right of women working in developing countries to safe workplaces, free from gender-based violence, reprisals, and intimidation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 427. A resolution designating April 2016 as "Financial Literacy Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. Res. 428. A resolution congratulating the 2016 national champions, the University of South Dakota Coyotes, for winning the 2016 Women's National Invitation Tournament; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. Res. 429. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of April 11 through April 15, 2016, as "National Assistant Principals Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 430. A resolution supporting the designation of April 20, 2016, as "Cheyenne Mountain Day"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 71

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on

Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 256

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 979

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 979, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 996

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 996, a bill to facilitate nationwide availability of volunteer income tax assistance for low-income and underserved populations, and for other purposes.

S. 1462

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1462, a bill to improve the safety of oil shipments by rail and for other purposes.

S. 1555

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1555, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 1715

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1715, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in com-

memoration of the 400th anniversary of the arrival of the Pilgrims.

S. 2002

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2002, a bill to strengthen our mental health system and improve public safety.

S. 2279

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2279, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program to increase efficiency in the recruitment and hiring by the Department of Veterans Affairs of health care workers that are undergoing separation from the Armed Forces, to create uniform credentialing standards for certain health care professionals of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 2292

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2292, a bill to reform laws relating to small public housing agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 2390

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2390, a bill to provide adequate protections for whistleblowers at the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

S. 2441

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2441, a bill to provide that certain Cuban entrants are ineligible to receive refugee assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 2469

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2469, a bill to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act.

S. 2540

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2540, a bill to provide access to counsel for unaccompanied children and other vulnerable populations.

S. 2548

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2548, a bill to establish the 400 Years of African-American History Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 2566

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2566, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide sexual assault survivors with certain rights, and for other purposes.

S. 2613

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota

(Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2613, a bill to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006.

S. 2614

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2614, a bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, to reauthorize the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program, and to promote initiatives that will reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism.

S. 2725

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2725, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to the ballistic missile program of Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 2746

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2746, a bill to establish various prohibitions regarding the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and with respect to United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, and for other purposes.

S. 2749

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2749, a bill to provide an exception from the reduced flat rate per diem for long-term temporary duty under Joint Travel Regulations for civilian employees of naval shipyards traveling for direct labor in support of off-yard work, and for other purposes.

S. 2752

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2752, a bill to prohibit the facilitation of certain financial transactions involving the Government of Iran or Iranian persons and to impose sanctions with respect to the facilitation of those transactions, and for other purposes.

S. 2755

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2755, a bill to provide Capitol-flown flags to the immediate family of firefighters, law enforcement officers, members of rescue squads or ambulance crews, and public safety officers who are killed in the line of duty.

S. 2782

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Minnesota

(Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2782, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of pediatric subspecialists in the National Health Service Corps program, and for other purposes.

S. 2790

At the request of Mr. VITTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2790, a bill to provide requirements for the appropriate Federal banking agencies when requesting or ordering a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, to provide for additional requirements related to subpoenas issued under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 349

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 349, a resolution congratulating the Farm Credit System on the celebration of its 100th anniversary.

S. RES. 383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 383, a resolution recognizing the importance of the United States-Israel economic relationship and encouraging new areas of cooperation.

S. RES. 422

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 422, a resolution supporting the mission and goals of 2016 "National Crime Victims' Rights Week", which include increasing public awareness of the rights, needs, concerns of, and services available to assist victims and survivors of crime in the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 3511

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3511 intended to be proposed to H.R. 636, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide an exclusion from income for student loan forgiveness for students who have died or become disabled; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a bill that I am introducing today, along with Senator COONS and Senator PORTMAN, called the Stop Taxing Death and Disability Act. It is a bill that responds to a tragic and unintended and frankly unsupportable policy—an inadvertent policy, I believe—of our government. Senator COONS has been a great leader on this, and I also wish to express my appreciation to Senator PORTMAN for joining.

Not long after I was elected, I was contacted by Donald and Nora Brennen, a couple from Topsham, ME, which is just across the river from my hometown of Brunswick. They are both retired Navy veterans, and they experienced a tragedy in their lives that has inadvertently entangled them with the Internal Revenue Service in a way that I think makes no sense.

Their son Keegan had graduated cum laude from the New Hampshire Institute of Art. He had taken on Federal and private loans in order to enable himself to get his education. He had a bright future. Unfortunately, barely 6 months after he graduated, he passed away suddenly from a non-traumatic brain aneurysm—a tragic loss which I think any of us as parents can only dimly appreciate or understand or empathize with. It is so unthinkable to lose a child in this way that it is just hard to conceive of.

The Federal Government has recognized this kind of situation and forgives the student loan indebtedness of students who pass away in this situation. The Federal Government gets that part right. Congress has already directed the Department of Education to forgive outstanding balances for borrowers who pass away, as well as those funds borrowed by parents on behalf of a child who passes away. The same forgiveness provision, by the way, is also permitted for borrowers who suffer total and permanent disabilities that are certified by the Social Security Administration and the Department of Veterans Affairs. So far, so good.

While the Federal Government solved that part of the problem, it inadvertently created another by recognizing that the Tax Code generally treats forgiven student debt as income in the year it is discharged. Because of this, this family in Maine who lost their son was suddenly—overnight—faced with a \$24,000 tax bill and a \$6,000 tax bill from the State of Maine because of its conformance with the Federal law.

In other words, you lose a child. The loans are forgiven, but the forgiveness is treated as taxable income, and suddenly, in the midst of your grief, you are faced with paying an enormous—one big tax bill on the entire amount of the loan being forgiven.

In this case, the Brennens couldn't possibly pay this in one instance, and it makes no sense from the point of view of policy. It is the opposite of compassion. It is literally adding insult to tragic injury.

Since 2012 when they lost their son, the Brennens have struggled to make ends meet. They had to go into their 401(k). They had to make some kind of arrangement with the IRS, and now they are in the process of paying this enormous tax off.

This family in Maine is not alone in facing this burden. My office has heard from other constituents in our State,

and our research indicates that there are at least several thousand across the country who are facing a tax bill in the midst of the most tragic and difficult circumstances. This just isn't right. It is something we should fix.

As I said, the Department of Education does have it right, and they are working on this, but until this unresolved tax issue is resolved, they can't move forward with an efficient way to provide these discharges.

The bill we are introducing today with Senator COONS and Senator PORTMAN, the Stop Taxing Death and Disability Act, is a commonsense, compassionate, and sensible response to this tragic event. If we are going to forgive the student loan debt, which makes total sense and has been the law for some time, to then turn around and say that loan forgiveness is itself taxable—so in the midst of your grief, you are presented with a massive tax bill—just isn't right. It is not fair, it is not right, it is not compassionate, and it isn't consistent with the earlier decision that has been made to discharge these loans under these tragic circumstances. I think it is time for Congress to add the death and disability exemption to the Tax Code.

I thank Don and Nora Brennen for sharing this story with me—it can't be an easy story to share—and for their service to this country in the U.S. Navy and their commitment to doing the right thing for their family.

I hope and believe we can find it in our wisdom here and in our hearts to act on this bill to be sure that other families in America in the midst of their grief do not have to face this tragic situation.

Again, I thank Senator COONS and Senator PORTMAN for joining me in this bipartisan effort to right a wrong, to correct a mistake, to act in the best principles of this institution, to act on behalf of this small group but important group who suffered loss, to act to relieve this burden that should never have been in place in the first place.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 425—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK

Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 425

Whereas the week of April 4, 2016, through April 10, 2016, was National Public Health Week;

Whereas the theme for National Public Health Week in 2016 was "Healthiest Nation 2030", with the goal of making the United

States the healthiest nation in one generation;

Whereas public health organizations use National Public Health Week to educate the public, policymakers, and public health professionals on issues that are important to improving the health of the people of the United States;

Whereas the value of a strong public health system is in the air we breathe, the water we drink, the food we eat, and the places in which we all live, learn, work, and play;

Whereas there is a significant difference in the health status of people living in the healthiest States compared to people living in the least healthy States, such as rates of obesity, poor mental health, and infectious disease;

Whereas public health professionals help communities prevent, prepare for, withstand, and recover from the impact of a full range of health threats, including disease outbreaks such as the Zika virus, natural disasters, and disasters caused by human activity;

Whereas public health professionals collaborate with partners that are not in the health sector, such as city planners, transportation officials, education officials, and private sector businesses, recognizing that other sectors have an important influence on health;

Whereas according to the National Academy of Medicine, despite being one of the wealthiest nations in the world, the United States ranks below many other economically prosperous and developing countries with respect to measures of health, including life expectancy, infant mortality rates, low birth weight rates, and the rate of drug-related deaths, which for overdose deaths involving opioids has increased by 200 percent since 2000;

Whereas studies show that small strategic investments in prevention can result in significant savings in health care costs;

Whereas each 10-percent increase in local public health spending contributes to a 6.9-percent decrease in infant deaths, a 3.2-percent decrease in deaths related to cardiovascular disease, a 1.4-percent decrease in deaths due to diabetes, and a 1.1-percent decrease in cancer-related deaths;

Whereas in communities across the country, more people are changing the way they care for their health by avoiding tobacco use, eating more healthfully, becoming more physically active, and preventing unintentional injuries at home and in the workplace;

Whereas despite having a high infant mortality rate as compared to other economically prosperous and developing countries and a death rate that varies greatly among States, overall the United States is making steady progress, with the infant mortality rate reaching a historic low in 2014, with 5.8 infant deaths per 1,000 live births;

Whereas the percentage of adults in the United States who smoke cigarettes, the leading cause of preventable disease and death in the United States, decreased from 20.9 percent in 2005 to 16.8 percent in 2014; and

Whereas efforts to adequately support public health and prevention can continue to transform a health system focused on treating illness to a health system focused on preventing disease and promoting wellness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Public Health Week;

(2) recognizes the efforts of public health professionals, the Federal Government, States, Indian tribes, municipalities, local communities, and individuals in preventing disease and injury;

(3) recognizes the role of public health in improving the health of individuals in the United States;

(4) encourages increased efforts and resources to improve the health of people in the United States to create the healthiest nation in one generation through—

(A) greater opportunities to improve community health and prevent disease and injury; and

(B) strengthening the public health system in the United States; and

(5) encourages the people of the United States to learn about the role of the public health system in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 426—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD SUPPORT AND PROTECT THE RIGHT OF WOMEN WORKING IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES TO SAFE WORKPLACES, FREE FROM GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE, REPRISALS, AND INTIMIDATION

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. MRKULSKI, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BROWN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 426

Whereas women in developing countries who join the industrial workforce suffer from, or become increasingly vulnerable to, economic violence, including forced overtime, wage theft, abusive short term contracts, discrimination, sexual harassment, and violence at work;

Whereas women typically make up the majority of the workforce in industries in which the rights of workers have been restricted, including—

(1) export manufacturing (including the global apparel industry); and

(2) other export sectors (including the cut flowers and fresh produce industries);

Whereas sexual violence is often used by a male manager as a means of intimidation or punishment when a female worker makes a mistake, fails to meet a production target, asks for leave, or arrives late to work;

Whereas women are particularly vulnerable to violence and intimidation at work due to—

(1) the frequently disproportionate number of male managers;

(2) the lack of policing and reporting of sexual harassment; and

(3) common cultural norms that assert male dominance and place disproportionate pressure on women to maintain their income and support their children and elders;

Whereas a survey of female garment industry workers in Bangladesh revealed that—

(1) nearly ⅓ of respondents had been a recipient of an unwelcome sexual overture, inappropriate touching, or a threat of being forced to undress; and

(2) nearly ½ of respondents had been beaten or struck in the face by a supervisor;

Whereas some of the most deadly accidents in industrial history have occurred in export processing industries in which female workers predominate, including—

(1) the fire at Ali Enterprises in Pakistan in 2012, the deadliest apparel factory fire in history, in which the lives of 259 workers were lost; and

(2) the collapse of the Rana Plaza building in 2013, in which the lives of 1,134 Bangladeshi workers were lost and 2,500 more workers were injured, the majority of whom were women;

Whereas these and other industrial accidents have occurred in facilities that were monitored and certified as safe and decent workplaces by private, voluntary corporate social responsibility initiatives invested in by global brands from the United States and Europe;

Whereas female workers are often knowingly exposed to dangerous and life-threatening machinery or toxic substances that are no longer used in developed nations due to their reproductive or general health effects, without even simple safety measures like gloves or face masks; and

Whereas research shows that—

(1) workers who are well-informed about health and safety facilitate safer workplaces; and

(2) legal protections that allow elected labor union representatives of workers to raise safety and other concerns without fear of reprisals are essential for worker safety: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States should—

(1) support policies that create safe and decent jobs in developing countries, which are critical to ensuring peaceful and sustainable economic growth and development in a globalized world;

(2) support policies that reduce gender-based violence, and other forms of discrimination, at work, and that improve the ability of women workers to speak out in defense of their rights without fear of reprisals;

(3) encourage the development of an International Labour Conference Convention to address gender-based violence at work;

(4) promote labor rights in trade agreements and enforce the right of women and other workers to join a labor union to defend their other rights and safety;

(5) use diplomatic means and international aid—

(A) to end violence against women in the workplace; and

(B) to empower women and other workers to participate fully in their economies and to protect their safety; and

(6) encourage United States companies with international supply chains, and Federal agencies involved in procurement, to increase transparency and accountability in order to ensure that products are produced in workplaces that—

(A) work aggressively to end gender-based workplace violence; and

(B) respect the rights of women workers.

SENATE RESOLUTION 427—DESIGNATING APRIL 2016 AS “FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH”

Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 427

Whereas according to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (referred to in this preamble as the “FDIC”), at least 27.7 percent of households in the United States, or nearly 34,400,000 households with approximately 67,600,000 adults, are unbanked or underbanked and therefore have not had an opportunity to access savings, lending, and other basic financial services;

Whereas according to the FDIC, approximately 30 percent of banks reported in 2011 that consumers lacked an understanding of the financial products and services banks offered;

Whereas according to the 2015 Consumer Financial Literacy Survey final report of the National Foundation for Credit Counseling—

(1) approximately 41 percent of adults in the United States gave themselves a grade of “C”, “D”, or “F” on their knowledge of personal finance;

(2) 75 percent of adults in the United States acknowledged that they could benefit from additional advice and answers to everyday financial questions from a professional;

(3) 24 percent of adults in the United States, or approximately 56,300,000 individuals, admitted to not paying bills on time;

(4) 1 in 3 households reported carrying credit card debt from month to month;

(5) only 39 percent of adults in the United States reported keeping close track of their spending, a percentage that held steady since 2007; and

(6) 13 percent of adults in the United States identified not having enough “rainy day” savings for an emergency, and 15 percent of adults in the United States identified not having enough money set aside for retirement, as the most worrisome area of personal finance;

Whereas the 2015 Retirement Confidence Survey conducted by the Employee Benefit Research Institute found that 24 percent of workers were “not at all confident” that they had enough money to retire;

Whereas according to the statistical release of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the fourth quarter of 2015 entitled “Financial Accounts of the United States: Flow of Funds, Balance Sheets, and Integrated Macroeconomic Accounts”, outstanding household debt in the United States was \$14,200,000,000,000 at the end of the fourth quarter of 2015;

Whereas according to the 2016 Survey of the States: Economic and Personal Finance Education in Our Nation’s Schools, a biennial report by the Council for Economic Education—

(1) only 20 States require students to take an economics course as a high school graduation requirement; and

(2) only 17 States require students to take a personal finance course as a high school graduation requirement, either independently or as part of an economics course;

Whereas according to the Gallup-HOPE Index, only 52 percent of students in the United States have money in a bank or credit union account;

Whereas expanding access to the safe, mainstream financial system will provide individuals with less expensive and more secure options for managing finances and building wealth;

Whereas quality personal financial education is essential to ensure that individuals are prepared—

(1) to manage money, credit, and debt; and

(2) to become responsible workers, heads of household, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens;

Whereas increased financial literacy empowers individuals to make wise financial decisions and reduces the confusion caused by an increasingly complex economy;

Whereas a greater understanding of, and familiarity with, financial markets and institutions will lead to increased economic activity and growth; and

Whereas, in 2003, Congress—

(1) determined that coordinating Federal financial literacy efforts and formulating a national strategy is important; and

(2) in light of that determination, passed the Financial Literacy and Education Im-

provement Act (20 U.S.C. 9701 et seq.), establishing the Financial Literacy and Education Commission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2016 as “Financial Literacy Month” to raise public awareness about—

(A) the importance of personal financial education in the United States; and

(B) the serious consequences that may result from a lack of understanding about personal finances; and

(2) calls on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the people of the United States to observe Financial Literacy Month with appropriate programs and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 428—CONGRATULATING THE 2016 NATIONAL CHAMPIONS, THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH DAKOTA COYOTES, FOR WINNING THE 2016 WOMEN’S NATIONAL INVITATION TOURNAMENT

Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 428

Whereas, on April 2, 2016, the University of South Dakota Coyotes defeated the Florida Gulf Coast University Eagles by a score of 71 to 65 in the final game of the Women’s National Invitation Tournament (referred to in this preamble as the “WNIT”) in Vermillion, South Dakota;

Whereas this is the first national title for the University of South Dakota Coyotes since the transition of the University of South Dakota to Division I athletics;

Whereas the Dakota Dome of the University of South Dakota, soon to be replaced with a new complex, hosted its final basketball game before a crowd of 7,415 fans;

Whereas the University of South Dakota Coyotes shot 71.4 percent from beyond the 3-point line and 54 percent overall from the field in their 34-point win in the semifinal of the WNIT;

Whereas senior guard Nicole Seekamp was named most valuable player of the WNIT and averaged 14 points per game throughout the WNIT;

Whereas seniors Tia Hemiller and Nicole Seekamp were each named to the WNIT all-tournament team;

Whereas the 2015–16 season was the fourth season for head coach Amy Williams, during which she won her first national title;

Whereas the University of South Dakota Coyotes finished the 2015–16 season with a record of 32–6; and

Whereas the presence of 5 seniors and 4 juniors on the roster of the University of South Dakota Coyotes represents the commitment of the seniors and juniors to the University of South Dakota and its work to enshrine the ideal of the student-athlete into the ethos of the University of South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates and honors the University of South Dakota women’s basketball team and its loyal fans on the performance of the team in the 2016 Women’s National Invitation Tournament; and

(2) recognizes and commends the hard work, dedication, determination, and commitment to excellence of the players, parents, families, coaches, and managers of the University of South Dakota women’s basketball team.

SENATE RESOLUTION 429—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF APRIL 11 THROUGH APRIL 15, 2016, AS “NATIONAL ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS WEEK”

Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 429

Whereas the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NAASP), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and the American Federation of School Administrators (AFSA) have designated the week of April 11 through April 15, 2016, as “National Assistant Principals Week”;

Whereas an assistant principal, as a member of the school administration, interacts with many sectors of the school community, including support staff, instructional staff, students, and parents;

Whereas assistant principals are responsible for establishing a positive learning environment and building strong relationships between school and community;

Whereas assistant principals play a pivotal role in the instructional leadership of their schools by supervising student instruction, mentoring teachers, recognizing the achievements of staff, encouraging collaboration among staff, ensuring the implementation of best practices, monitoring student achievement and progress, facilitating and modeling data-driven decision-making to inform instruction, and guiding the direction of targeted intervention and school improvement;

Whereas the day-to-day logistical operations of schools require assistant principals to monitor and address facility needs, attendance, transportation issues, and scheduling challenges, as well as supervise extra- and co-curricular events;

Whereas assistant principals are entrusted with maintaining an inviting, safe, and orderly school environment that supports the growth and achievement of each and every student by nurturing positive peer relationships, recognizing student achievement, mediating conflicts, analyzing behavior patterns, providing interventions, and, when necessary, taking disciplinary actions;

Whereas since its establishment in 2004, the NAASP National Assistant Principal of the Year Program recognizes outstanding middle and high school assistant principals who demonstrate success in leadership, curriculum, and personalization; and

Whereas the week of April 11 through April 15, 2016, is an appropriate week to designate as National Assistant Principals Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of April 11 through April 15, 2016, as “National Assistant Principals Week”;

(2) honors the contributions of assistant principals to the success of students in the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Assistant Principals Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the role played by assistant principals in school leadership and ensuring that every child has access to a high-quality education.

SENATE RESOLUTION 430—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF APRIL 20, 2016, AS “CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN DAY”

Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 430

Whereas, since 1966, Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station (in this preamble referred to as “Cheyenne Mountain”) in Colorado Springs, Colorado, has been a synergistic hub for tracking security threats worldwide, serving as an essential component to the defense of North America and to global security;

Whereas countless space and ground sensor data collections are synthesized at Cheyenne Mountain, providing vital information for the key threat assessments needed to ensure the safety and security of millions of people throughout North America;

Whereas the 21st Space Wing at Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado Springs, Colorado, provides operational support and infrastructure sustainability;

Whereas the 721st Mission Support Group at Cheyenne Mountain provides dedicated daily sustainment to more than 13 mission partners performing the national security mission inside of the Cheyenne Mountain Complex;

Whereas, every day, more than 1,000 military and civilian personnel of the United States and Canada, residing in Colorado and working at Cheyenne Mountain, are ever vigilant in ensuring the collective common defense of North America;

Whereas Cheyenne Mountain is—

- (1) a valuable national security asset;
- (2) seen as one of the greatest engineering marvels of its time; and
- (3) relevant both now and in the future;

Whereas Colorado is proud to be a nexus of capabilities that provide for the defense of North America, which is critical to global security not only today but also in the future; and

Whereas April 20, 2016, is the 50th anniversary of Cheyenne Mountain achieving full operational capability and would be an appropriate date to designate as “Cheyenne Mountain Day”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of April 20, 2016, as “Cheyenne Mountain Day”;

(2) recognizes the strategic importance of Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station to the defense of North America; and

(3) commends the efforts of the 21st Space Wing, the 721st Mission Support Group, and the 1,000 military and civilian personnel of the United States and Canada working at the Cheyenne Mountain Complex to support the collective common defense of North America.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3789. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3725 submitted by Mr. FLAKE and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 3679 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON)) to the bill H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3790. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3557 submitted by Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. COL-

LINS, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 636, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3791. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3568 submitted by Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 3464 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3792. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3754 submitted by Mr. HATCH and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 3679 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON)) to the bill H.R. 636, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3793. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3464 submitted by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3794. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3464 submitted by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3795. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3464 submitted by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3796. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3464 submitted by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3797. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3464 submitted by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3789. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3725 submitted by Mr. FLAKE and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 3679 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON)) to the bill H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

(d) **LIMITATION ON EFFECT UNTIL CRIMINALS EXTRADITED.**—This section shall not apply until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Cuba has extradited or otherwise rendered to the United States all individuals in Cuba who are sought by the Department of Justice for crimes committed in the United States, including—

(1) General Ruben Martinez Puente, Colonel Lorenzo Alberto Perez-Perez, and Colonel Francisco Perez-Perez; and

(2) fugitive hijackers residing in Cuba, including Charlie Hill.

(e) **LIMITATION ON EFFECT UNTIL COMPENSATION PROVIDED FOR CONFISCATED PROPERTY.**—This section shall not apply until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Cuba has—

(1) returned to all United States citizens, and entities for which United States citizens have an ownership interest of 50 percent or more, property confiscated from those citizens and entities by the Government of Cuba on or after January 1, 1959; or

(2) provided equitable compensation to those citizens and entities for such confiscated property.

(f) LIMITATION ON EFFECT UNTIL COMPENSATION PROVIDED FOR JUDGMENTS IN UNITED STATES.—This section shall not apply until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Cuba has provided compensation to resolve all outstanding judgments against the Government of Cuba issued by a court in the United States.

SA 3790. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3557 submitted by Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

(d) LIMITATION ON EFFECT UNTIL CRIMINALS EXTRADITED.—This section shall not apply until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Cuba has extradited or otherwise rendered to the United States all individuals in Cuba who are sought by the Department of Justice for crimes committed in the United States, including—

(1) General Ruben Martinez Puente, Colonel Lorenzo Alberto Perez-Perez, and Colonel Francisco Perez-Perez; and

(2) fugitive hijackers residing in Cuba, including Charlie Hill.

(e) LIMITATION ON EFFECT UNTIL COMPENSATION PROVIDED FOR CONFISCATED PROPERTY.—This section shall not apply until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Cuba has—

(1) returned to all United States citizens, and entities for which United States citizens have an ownership interest of 50 percent or more, property confiscated from those citizens and entities by the Government of Cuba on or after January 1, 1959; or

(2) provided equitable compensation to those citizens and entities for such confiscated property.

(f) LIMITATION ON EFFECT UNTIL COMPENSATION PROVIDED FOR JUDGMENTS IN UNITED STATES.—This section shall not apply until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Cuba has provided compensation to resolve all outstanding judgments against the Government of Cuba issued by a court in the United States.

SA 3791. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3568 submitted by Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING) and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 3464 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

(f) LIMITATION ON EFFECT UNTIL CRIMINALS EXTRADITED.—This section shall not apply until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Cuba has extradited or otherwise rendered to the United States all individuals in Cuba who are sought by the Department of Justice for crimes committed in the United States, including—

(1) General Ruben Martinez Puente, Colonel Lorenzo Alberto Perez-Perez, and Colonel Francisco Perez-Perez; and

(2) fugitive hijackers residing in Cuba, including Charlie Hill.

(g) LIMITATION ON EFFECT UNTIL COMPENSATION PROVIDED FOR CONFISCATED PROPERTY.—This section shall not apply until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Cuba has—

(1) returned to all United States citizens, and entities for which United States citizens have an ownership interest of 50 percent or more, property confiscated from those citizens and entities by the Government of Cuba on or after January 1, 1959; or

(2) provided equitable compensation to those citizens and entities for such confiscated property.

(h) LIMITATION ON EFFECT UNTIL COMPENSATION PROVIDED FOR JUDGMENTS IN UNITED STATES.—This section shall not apply until the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Cuba has provided compensation to resolve all outstanding judgments against the Government of Cuba issued by a court in the United States.

SA 3792. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3754 submitted by Mr. HATCH and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 3679 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON)) to the bill H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 5033. AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL SLOT EXEMPTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the provisions of section 5032 of this Act and notwithstanding sections 49104(a)(5), 49109, and 41714 of title 49, United States Code, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, by order, grant exemptions from the requirements of subparts K and S of part 93 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, to enable air carriers to operate limited frequencies and aircraft on routes between Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and airports located beyond the perimeter restriction.

(b) BEYOND-PERIMETER OPERATIONS.—The Secretary shall make available, upon request, not more than 2 exemptions made available under subsection (a) to each air carrier that—

(1) sells flights in its own name;

(2) has daily scheduled service at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport as of the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(3) commits, in using such an exemption—

(A) to discontinue the use of a slot for service between Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and a large hub airport within the perimeter restriction and to operate, in place of such service, service between Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and a medium hub airport or small hub airport located beyond the perimeter restriction that has no daily nonstop air service to Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport as of the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) to operate an aircraft, not to include a multi-aisle or wide body aircraft, with equal or lesser passenger capacity when compared to the aircraft used on service discontinued under subparagraph (A); and

(C) to file a notice of intent with the Secretary to inform the Secretary of any change in circumstances concerning the use of the exemption that specifies the airport to be served using the exemption, the type of aircraft to be used, and the slot the carrier is discontinuing under subparagraph (A).

(c) AIR CARRIER DISCRETION.—Except with respect to the requirements of subsection (b),

an air carrier that receives an exemption under subsection (a) shall have sole discretion concerning the use of the exemption, including the selection of the initial airport and any subsequent airports to be served.

(d) RETURN OF WITHIN-PERIMETER SLOTS.—An air carrier shall be entitled to the return by the Secretary of a slot for flights within the perimeter restriction if the use of an exemption made available to the air carrier under subsection (a) is discontinued.

(e) PROHIBITION AGAINST TRANSFERS.—In accordance with section 41714(j) of title 49, United States Code, an exemption granted under subsection (a) to an air carrier may not be bought, sold, leased, or otherwise transferred by the air carrier.

SA 3793. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3464 submitted by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1215 and insert the following:

SEC. 1215. REPORT ON NON-MOVEMENT AREA SURVEILLANCE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) assessing the feasibility and advisability of a pilot program to support non-Federal acquisition and installation of qualifying non-movement area surveillance surface display systems and sensors;

(2) evaluating if—

(A) acquisition and installation of qualifying non-movement area surveillance surface display systems and sensors improve safety or capacity in the National Airspace System; and

(B) the non-movement area surveillance surface display systems and sensors are supplemental to existing movement area systems and sensors at the selected airports established under other programs administered by the Administrator; and

(3) making recommendations with respect to the content of the pilot program described in paragraph (1), including with respect to procurement procedures and the possibility of establishing data exchange processes to allow airport participation in the Federal Aviation Administration's Airport Collaborative Decision Making process and fusion of the non-movement surveillance data with the Administration's movement area systems.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) NON-MOVEMENT AREA.—The term “non-movement area” is the portion of the airfield surface that is not under the control of air traffic control.

(2) NON-MOVEMENT AREA SURVEILLANCE SURFACE DISPLAY SYSTEM AND SENSORS.—The term “non-movement area surveillance surface display system and sensors” is a non-Federal surveillance system that uses on-airport sensors that track vehicles or aircraft that are equipped with transponders in the non-movement area.

(3) QUALIFYING NON-MOVEMENT AREA SURVEILLANCE SURFACE DISPLAY SYSTEM AND SENSORS.—The term “qualifying non-movement area surveillance surface display system and sensors” is a non-movement area surveillance surface display system that—

(A) provides the required transmit and receive data formats consistent with the National Airspace System architecture at the appropriate service delivery point;

- (B) is on-airport; and
(C) is airport operated.

SA 3794. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3464 submitted by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 59, strike line 18 and all that follows through page 60, line 2, and insert the following:

(c) **DEADLINE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress the consensus identification standards, and the Administrator shall issue legislative recommendations for codifying such standards.

SA 3795. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3464 submitted by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 131, strike lines 11 through 19, and insert the following:

(C) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In making a determination whether to grant or deny an application for a designation, the Administrator shall consider—

- (i) aviation safety;
- (ii) personal safety of the uninvolved public;
- (iii) national security; and
- (iv) homeland security.

SA 3796. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3464 submitted by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 2303 and insert the following:

SEC. 2303. AIRCRAFT TRACKING AND FLIGHT DATA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall assess current performance standards and submit to Congress recommendations for revising the standards to improve near-term and long-term aircraft tracking and flight data recovery, including retrieval, access, and protection of such data after an incident or accident.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In assessing the performance standards under subsection (a), the Administrator shall consider—

- (1) various methods for improving detection and retrieval of flight data, including—
 - (A) low frequency underwater locating devices; and
 - (B) extended battery life for underwater locating devices;
- (2) automatic deployable flight recorders;
- (3) triggered transmission of flight data, and other satellite-based solutions;
- (4) distress-mode tracking; and

(5) protections against disabling flight recorder systems.

(c) **COORDINATION.**—In assessing the possibility of revising performance standards under subsection (a), the Administrator shall consult with international regulatory authorities and the International Civil Aviation Organization to assess how to ensure that any new international standard for aircraft tracking and flight data recovery is consistent with a performance based approach and is implemented in a globally harmonized manner.

SA 3797. Mr. SASSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3464 submitted by Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to the bill H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 3109 and insert the following:

SEC. 3109. REFUNDS FOR DELAYED BAGGAGE.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit recommendations to Congress with respect to the feasibility and advisability of requiring a covered air carrier to promptly provide an automatic refund to a passenger in the amount of any applicable ancillary fees paid if the covered air carrier has charged the passenger an ancillary fee for checked baggage but the covered air carrier fails to deliver the checked baggage to the passenger not later than 6 to 12 hours after the arrival of a domestic flight or 12 to 24 hours after the arrival of an international flight.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 14, 2016, at 9:30 a.m., in room SR-328A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 14, 2016, at 10:45 a.m., in the President's Room of the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. GARDNER. 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 April 14, 2016, at 9 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 14, 2016, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The Federal Perspective on the State of Our Nation's Biodefense."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 14, 2016, 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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 14, 2016, at 2 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 14, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE, AND INVESTMENT AND THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment and Economic Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 14, 2016, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Examining the Current Trends and Changes in Fixed-Income Markets."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEVADA NATIVE NATIONS LAND ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 377, S. 1436

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1436) to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Nevada Native Nations Land Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this Act, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE FORT MCDERMITT PAIUTE AND SHOSHONE TRIBE.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term “map” means the map entitled “Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation Expansion Act”, dated February 21, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 19,094 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as “Reservation Expansion Lands”.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE SHOSHONE PAIUTE TRIBES.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term “map” means the map entitled “Mountain City Administrative Site Proposed Acquisition”, dated July 29, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights and paragraph (4), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Shoshone Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Shoshone Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 82 acres of land administered by the Forest Service as generally depicted on the map as “Proposed Acquisition Site”.

(4) CONDITION ON CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance under paragraph (2) shall be subject to the reservation of an easement on the conveyed land for a road to provide access to adjacent National Forest System land for use by the Forest Service for administrative purposes.

(5) FACILITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS.—The Secretary of Agriculture (acting through the Chief of the Forest Service) shall convey to the Shoshone Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation any existing facilities or improvements to the land described in paragraph (3).

(c) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE SUMMIT LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this section, the term “map” means the map entitled “Summit Lake Indian Reservation Conveyance”, dated February 28, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 941 acres of land administered by the Bureau of

Land Management as generally depicted on the map as “Reservation Conveyance Lands”.

(d) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE RENO-SPARKS INDIAN COLONY.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term “map” means the map entitled “Reno-Sparks Indian Colony Expansion”, dated June 11, 2014, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 13,434 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as “RSIC Amended Boundary”.

(e) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE.—

(1) MAP.—In this subsection, the term “map” means the map entitled “Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation Expansion”, dated April 13, 2015, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 6,357 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as “Reservation Expansion Lands”.

(f) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE DUCKWATER SHOSHONE TRIBE.—

(1) MAP.—In this subsection, the term “map” means the map entitled “Duckwater Reservation Expansion”, dated October 15, 2015, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 31,229 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as “Reservation Expansion Lands”.

(g) REVOCATION OF PUBLIC LAND ORDERS.—Any public land order that withdraws any portion of land conveyed to an Indian tribe under this section shall be revoked to the extent necessary to permit the conveyance of the land.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) SURVEY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust for each Indian tribe under section 3.

(b) USE OF TRUST LAND.—

(1) GAMING.—Land taken into trust under section 3 shall not be eligible, or considered to have been taken into trust, for class II gaming or class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

(2) THINNING; LANDSCAPE RESTORATION.—With respect to the land taken into trust under sec-

tion 3, the Secretary, in consultation and coordination with the applicable Indian tribe, may carry out any fuel reduction and other landscape restoration activities, including restoration of sage grouse habitat, on the land that is beneficial to the Indian tribe and the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1436), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL POW/MIA REMEMBRANCE ACT OF 2015

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1670, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1670) to direct the Architect of the Capitol to place in the United States Capitol a chair honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1670) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HONORING RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY, AS RUTGERS CELEBRATES ITS 250TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 311.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 311) honoring Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, as Rutgers celebrates its 250th anniversary.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon

the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 311) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of November 9, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 427, S. Res. 428, S. Res. 429, and S. Res. 430.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDER FOR INTERVENING DAY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Friday, April 15, count as the intervening day with respect to the cloture motion on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2028.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2016

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, April 18; 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; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 636.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2016, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:11 p.m., adjourned until Monday, April 18, 2016, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. LORI J. ROBINSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JON T. THOMAS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN M. TWITTY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN G. ROSSI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ROBERT B. BROWN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CHARLES G. CHIAROTTI

BRIG. GEN. DAVID W. COFFMAN

BRIG. GEN. PAUL J. KENNEDY

BRIG. GEN. JOAQUIN F. MALAVET

BRIG. GEN. LORETTA E. REYNOLDS

BRIG. GEN. RUSSELL A. SANBORN

BRIG. GEN. GEORGE W. SMITH, JR.

BRIG. GEN. MARK R. WISE

BRIG. GEN. DANIEL D. YOO

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DEPUTY COMMANDANT FOR OPERATIONS, A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 50:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. CHARLES W. RAY

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JONATHAN M. LETSINGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

LLOYD TRAVIS A. ARNOLD

SALLY A. BAKER

MICHAEL W. BEST

JARED T. BRADLEY

CAMERON C. CARTIER

CHARLES H. CHESNUT III

CURTIS C. COPELAND

JEFFREY D. DELLAVOLPE

DANIEL R. FARBER

BENJAMIN T. FEENEY

GEOFFREY C. GARST

WILLIAM G. GENSHEIMER

JESSICA C. HAYES

PETER C. HSU

JUSTIN J. KOENIG

DANN J. LAUDERMILCH

KAREN J. LEE

THOMAS J. MEREDITH

DANIEL MILMO

REINALDO MORALES

KERRA MURRAY

RACHAEL L. NEMCIC

SOHIL M. PATEL

CHIG S. POSTER

LAURA K. RANDOLPH

JOSE E. REYES III

ISAMI SAKAI

SANDIPANI M. SANDILYA

JOHN A. SHANER

CHRISTI L. SHERMAN

MATTHEW T. SMITH

STEPHANIE M. STRETT

EMILY L. STURGILL

COREY M. TEAGARDEN
CASEY T. TURNER
DAVID J. VARGAS
HEATHER J. WERTH
BRENT J. WILKERSON
STUART S. WINKLER
MARIA V. ZILINSKI
KEVIN R. ZIMMERMAN
KONSTANTINA ZUBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

KRISTIE L. PARTIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

AIMEE D. SAFFORD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

TRACEY A. GOSSER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

TODD R. HOWELL

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

PHILLIP W. NEAL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624:

To be colonel

KODJO S. KNOXIMBACKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LORI R. SCHANHALS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DREW R. CONOVER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BRADLEY D. OSTERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

FRANCISCO J. LOPEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

MONICA J. MILTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TIMOTHY D. AIKEN

MATTHEW R. SARACCO

BRENT D. TROUT

JAMES R. WEAKLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

GEORGE A. ROLLINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MCARTHUR WALKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

TIMOTHY D. COVINGTON

JOHNSON C. GOURD, JR.
GREGORY P. JOUBERT
ERIC A. KENNEDY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

DONALD E. SPEIGHTS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

TIMOTHY M. DUNN
DAVID M. FILLIS
MARK L. HENSON
JOSEPH D. KASNY
TIMOTHY P. MCALLISTER
RYAN M. MCCORMICK
KENNETH D. NASH
PEGGYTARA M. STOLYAROVA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

SUZANNE M. LESKO
CHARLES E. SUMMERS II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

ANDREW F. ULAK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

KENNETH N. GRAVES
MARK M. MEADE
BILLY B. OSBORNE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

STEVE R. PARADELA
JOSHUA J. RUSSELL
REESE K. ZOMAR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

CHARLES M. BROWN
JOHN E. BYINGTON
KEVIN G. CRUMLISH
JOSEPH L. CUBBA
JOHN E. DAVIS
ERIC L. DENIS
THOMAS E. FOUTS
CHRISTOPHER D. ISAKSON
KEVIN A. JANKOWSKI
CRAIG M. LAWLESS
ANNE H. LOCKHART
HEATH L. MARCUS
KATHERINE S. MUELLER
KATHLEEN A. POWELL
DEREK S. REVERON
JAMES E. TOCZKO
EDWARD D. WHISTON
KARL W. WICK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

ROBERT K. BAER
JOHN L. MORRIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

BRIAN S. ANDERTON
DAVID N. BARNES

THEODORE J. BEATTY
KYLE D. BRADY
JEFFREY A. BUTCHER
JOHN D. CARLSON
JOSEPH A. CARNELL
ARTHUR M. CASTIGLIA
ELLIOTT I. I. CLEMENCE
RUSSELL J. COOLMAN
SUZANNE L. DALTON
CRAIG S. DERANANIAN
DAVID B. DIAMOND
STEPHAN R. DUPOURQUE
MARK J. EARLY
DAVID J. FAEHNLE
KEITH D. FERNANDEZ
TODD C. FINK
MICHAEL G. FRIEBE
THOMAS G. FRIEDER
WILLIAM S. GARRETT III
JOHN A. GREENE
KAREN M. GRIFFITH
ROBERT L. GUERIN
MARK L. HARRISON
DARRYL L. HOWELL
BRADLEY C. JEFFERIES
JEFFREY A. JURGEMEYER
JAMES M. KATIN
CRAIG S. KUJAWA
ALLEN C. KUNKLE
CHRISTOPHER D. MACMILLAN
RICHARD A. MALONEY
JAMES W. MASON
ALBERT A. MATT
MICHAEL S. MATTIS
ERIC D. MCCARTY
RICHARD K. MCHUGH
PATRICIA L. MELSEN
ANTHONY H. MILLER
BRIAN R. MILLER
JAMES R. MILLER
ANTHONY P. NELIPOVICH
SARAH A. NOLIN
CHRISTIAN A. ORTEGO
ROGER J. OUMET
PETER G. PATTERSON
DINIS L. PIMENTEL
JONATHAN C. PUSKAS
EYRAN E. RICHARDS
TODD H. ROMNEY
CRAIG RUBIN
JOHN D. SACCOMANDO
ANDREW J. SCHREINER
KYLE D. SCHUMAN
MICHAEL E. SHARP
ANTHONY C. SMITH, SR.
BRYON T. SMITH
EDWIN A. SMITH
WILLIAM D. STROMBERG
JOHN F. SWEETER, JR.
BRETT E. TITTLE
OSCAR J. TOLEDO
ROBERT TREMAYNE
MICHAEL R. VANPOOTS
KENNETH E. WAGENHAUSER
DEAN E. WENCE
SAMUEL S. WEST
CARL V. WIGHOLM
JAMES T. WORTHINGTON III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

CHRISTOPHER J. R. DEMCHAK
BILLY D. FRANKLIN II
LUKE A. FROST
MATTHEW T. HART
DANIEL S. LAYTON
DOUGLAS J. MUNZ
WAYNE D. OETINGER
WILLIAM PILCHER
SEAN M. RICH
ANTHONY F. SCARPINO, JR.
CHAN H. SHIN
JASON E. SMALL
KATE M. STANDIFER
STEVEN R. THOMPSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JANETTE B. JOSE
GARY S. LEFEBVRE
MICHAEL J. SCHWERIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

ERIC R. JOHNSON
GLEN J. OLOUGHLIN
JULIET A. PERKINS
ANDREW R. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JAREMA M. DIDOSZAK
SHEILA JENKINS
BRANDON J. LARSON
WILLIAM L. ROTH
RICHARD D. SUSSMAN
RICHARD M. SZCEPANSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

CONRADO G. DUNGCA, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

ALEXANDER L. PEABODY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be captain

JASON G. GOFF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LUIS A. BENCOMO

THE JUDICIARY

BETH M. ANDRUS, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNITED
STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT
OF WASHINGTON, VICE ROBERT S. LASNIK, RETIRED.

J. MICHAEL DIAZ, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNITED
STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT
OF WASHINGTON, VICE JAMES L. ROBART, RETIRING.

KATHLEEN M. O'SULLIVAN, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN
DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, VICE MARSHA J. PECHMAN,
RETIRED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE
OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FOR APPOINTMENT AS A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF
CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN
THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA:

MARIANO J. BEILLARD, OF FLORIDA
ANTHONY J. GILBERT, OF ALASKA
ALICIA ISOM HERNANDEZ, OF CALIFORNIA
JESS K. PAULSON, OF OREGON
CHRISTOPHER D. RIKER, OF MARYLAND
WILLIAM G. VERZANI, OF NEBRASKA

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE
OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
FOR APPOINTMENT AS A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF
CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN
THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA:

NATHAN SEIFERT, OF UTAH
YURI ARTHUR, OF CALIFORNIA
THOMAS HANSON, OF CALIFORNIA
JEFFREY JUSTICE, OF NORTH CAROLINA

THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE
FOR APPOINTMENT AS A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF
CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN
THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA:

RACHEL KREISSL, OF FLORIDA
OLGA FORD, OF VIRGINIA
DEVIN RAMBO, OF NORTH CAROLINA
JOSHUA BURKE, OF ILLINOIS

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CATOR, RUMA & ASSOCIATES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cator, Ruma & Associates for receiving the Business Recognition Award from the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation.

Cator, Ruma & Associates recently added 26 high-paying jobs to its headquarters in Lakewood—making it a perfect recipient of the Business Recognition Award which is given to companies that show growth in primary employment, sales and/or capital investment in the last year.

Since 1959, Cator, Ruma & Associates has been providing consulting engineering services for institutional, commercial, industrial and medical facilities throughout Colorado and the Western Region. Currently, it has more than 90 employees and three offices in the Western Region. Recent projects include the redevelopment of Denver Union Station, the Kaiser Permanente facility in Westminster, and the Employee Pub at MillerCoors in Golden.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cator, Ruma & Associates for this well-deserved recognition by Jefferson County EDC. Thank you for your contributions to the Jefferson County economy and community.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FUTURE
SCIENTISTS AND TECH-
NOLOGISTS—CHANDLER GARRI-
SON

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chandler Garrison from Pearland, TX for being accepted into the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists to represent the state of Texas at the Congress of Future Science and Technology leaders.

Chandler attends Glenda Dawson High School and is one of 13 high school honor students selected from the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas. These students were selected as Texas delegates at the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders. This program was designed for high school students to be recognized for their hard work in school, as well as to support their aspirations of working in a science or technology field. The National Academy was founded by Richard Rossi and Dr. Robert Darling; Mr. Rossi currently serves as president. The Congress is being held at the Tsongas Center at the University of Massachusetts, Lowell from June 29th through July 1st. Chandler was selected by a group of educators to be a delegate for the Congress thanks to his dedication

to his academic success and goals of pursuing science or technology. We are proud of Chandler and all of his hard work, and know he will make Pearland proud.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Chandler for being accepted into the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists. Keep up the great work.

HONORING THE THOMPSON-
CLEMONS POST NUMBER 200

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Thompson-Clemons Post Number 200 of Greenwood, Mississippi.

The Thompson-Clemons Post Number 200 of Greenwood, Mississippi was the first African American Post established in the State of Mississippi and came about due to the perseverance of eighteen determined Black Veterans of World War I and World War II in the Mississippi Delta.

These veterans attempted to join Keeler-Hamrick-Gillespie Post Number 29 which refused them membership. Given that this was the 1940s and Mississippi being a segregationist state, Post Number 29 could not get a majority vote of its members to allow black veterans to join their post.

The eighteen black veterans filed a petition to start a new post and presented it to the Mississippi Department of the American Legion. Mr. Solomon N. Dickerson, a black veteran, postal worker and co-worker of Mr. Author H. Richter, the Adjutant of post Number 29, worked to get the petition through the District. It was due to their vigorous and persistent correspondence to the District and the Mississippi Department of the American Legion that they were allowed to form a separate post if they could find a sponsor.

Keesler-Hamrick-Gillespie Post Number 29 agreed to serve as a sponsor to assist Thompson-Clemons Post Number 200 in getting the temporary charter, paving the way for other charters to be granted to other black veteran's groups throughout the state of Mississippi.

Originally, the post was called the Mississippi Delta Post Number 200. Mr. L.H. Threadgill, principal of Stone Street High School, a veteran of World War II, proposed that the post be named after two former students of Stone Street High School, that were killed in action during WWII. The motion carried and the name was adopted. Thompson-Clemons Post Number 200 was granted a permanent charter on July 28, 1949, becoming the first Black post in the State of Mississippi. The first Post Commander was Mr. Solomon N. Dickerson.

Mr. L.H. Threadgill and others in the community were instrumental in purchasing the

property, obtaining a deed, and getting a building to establish a post headquarters where it is still located today.

The Thompson-Clemons Post Number 200 of Greenwood, Mississippi has a distinct track record of encouragement to veterans with issues, be they be from serving abroad; in combat situations or statewide service. Issues range from transportation to Regional Office and VA Hospital for medical disability claims, educational and skill training, housing and other activities including establishing collaborative partnerships with community organizations to provide emergency services such as utilities, homes for the homeless, counseling and assistance in understanding the myriad of services provided by the VA.

The VA community activities include sponsorship of little league baseball teams, voter education classes, veterans day celebration, adopt a school program, donations to needy families, Boys State Program and the National American Legion Oratorical Contest, where candidates sponsored by Post Number 200, have won the Mississippi State Championship four times, and three out of the past four years.

Leadership activities include a weekly live call in radio talk program aired on WGNL 104.3 FM in Greenwood, Mississippi where veterans can actually dial up and talk about issues that affect them and their community. Partnering with organizations such as the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Greenwood Voters League, Mississippi Valley State University and other community based groups that advocate for social justice.

Thompson-Clemons Post Number 200 is well integrated into the fabric and culture of the Mississippi Delta and should be recognized as a Post that has the interest of our service men, their families and community at heart.

The American Legion Post Number 200 is moving forward to continue the legacy of those early veterans who honorably served their country and had the vision that through the American Legion and its core principles, they could continue to protect and build an America and Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a remarkable organization, The Thompson-Clemons Post Number 200, for its dedication to serving our veterans and giving back to the African American community.

TRIBUTE TO BETH JONES

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Beth Jones for being named a 2016 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2016 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 640 business leaders and growing.

As the Public Benefit Manager for Delta Dental of Iowa, Beth works each and every day to make them one of the leaders in oral health in the state. She is dedicated to improving the overall image of the company through hard work and education. Beth has been passionate about serving Iowans through the Iowa Public Health Association by raising awareness that a commitment to public health can provide major benefits to communities and lead them in a positive direction. She is also dedicated to serving others through the development of the Lifelong Smiles Coalition, an organization focused on increased access to oral health care for older adults.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Beth in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Beth on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2016 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

HONORING MS. DIXIE TREBBE

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ms. Dixie Trebbe, a tireless volunteer, a fierce leader, and a passionate advocate. She has always been involved in the political process and encouraged others to participate and exercise their fundamental right to vote. Dixie is also on the American Association of University Women's National Public Policy Committee, the New Mexico NOW State Board, and the New Mexico Capital City Task Force for the AARP, and she is active with the American Legion Auxiliary and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

New Mexico's legislators know Dixie as a passionate champion of issues that face our community, and new volunteers know her as a role model. As an octogenarian, Dixie sets an example for all generations, showing us what real service is and what commitment to justice can accomplish.

Dixie will be leaving New Mexico to live with her children in Iowa, and while we are sorry to see her go, New Mexico's loss will surely be Iowa's gain. Dixie, thank you for your service.

RECOGNIZING MR. ART PING LEE FOR HIS LEADERSHIP AND ADVOCACY FOR THE ASIAN-AMERICAN COMMUNITIES AND IN CELEBRATION OF HIS 102ND BIRTHDAY

HON. JOHN K. DELANEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize the lifetime work and achievements of Mr. Art Ping Lee who has worked tirelessly to advocate on behalf of the overseas Chinese community.

Born in Taishan County, Guangdong Province of the Republic of China, Lee immigrated to the United States in 1936 and began his advocacy work soon thereafter.

Mr. Lee is one of the Founders of the Chinese Youth Club which has served the Asian community of the Greater Washington DC area since 1939. The CYC program helps young people celebrate their cultural identity and serve the community.

Additionally, Lee was one of the founders of the National Chinese Welfare Council (NCWC) in 1957. The NCWC spearheaded successful advocacy efforts which included lifting the limitations on Chinese immigrant quotas and establishing permanent residency status and other social benefits for Chinese immigrants to the United States.

Mr. Lee, who turns 102 this year, continues to contribute to his community where he serves as an Honorary Elder of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association (CCBA) of Washington, DC, a Senior Advisor to the Overseas Community Affairs Council of the Republic of China (Taiwan), and an Honorary Elder to The Lee Family Association in the United States.

Mr. Art Ping Lee has led an incredible career of service and is widely respected for his work to better the lives of Chinese-Americans. He is the recipient of the Hua Kuang Medal, First Class from the government of Republic of China (Taiwan) which is the top honor for Chinese who have made special contributions in overseas Chinese affairs.

I would like to honor Mr. Art Ping Lee today and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF LAKE-SUMTER STATE COLLEGE FOUNDATION, INC.

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the Lake-Sumter State College (LSSC) Foundation, Inc. as they celebrate their 35th anniversary on April 16, 2016.

Founded in 1980, the Lake-Sumter State College Foundation supports Lake-Sumter State College's mission of developing community through education. Since its founding, the LSSC Foundation brings together individuals, businesses, and organizations to support the Lake-Sumter State College through the fund-

ing of projects that enhance the quality of teaching and learning. These projects include classroom and athletic equipment, the library, the nursing program, the computer lab, and support for students and faculty.

The LSSC Foundation is governed by a Board of Directors comprised of leaders in our community who are dedicated to equipping students with the essential tools for fulfilling careers and empowering them to be leaders within their community. In the spirit of providing educational opportunities for our community's students, the LSSC Foundation, Inc. awards more than \$500,000 in scholarships each year to help students invest in their futures. The LSSC Foundation has had a paramount impact on the lives of students, and many have benefited from its generous contributions. In the past 12 years, the LSSC Foundation has grown from \$3 million in assets to more than \$16 million in assets, bolstering the education and passions of future generations.

I am thankful for the Lake-Sumter State College Foundation and their tremendous contributions to our community. The future of our nation is in the hands of our young people, and the Lake-Sumter State College Foundation's investment in them cannot be over appreciated.

COMMEMORATING GEORGE WASHINGTON LODGE NO. 143, FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS, ON ITS 200TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate George Washington Lodge No. 143, Free and Accepted Masons, of Chambersburg, PA, on its 200th anniversary.

Similar to the Borough of Chambersburg, the George Washington Masonic Lodge No. 143 has a history dating back nearly to our country's founding. Having been resurrected by a group of committed Masons who sent a petition to Grand Lodge for a warrant to institute George Washington Lodge No. 143, the lodge has maintained this historic presence since 1816. A point of local pride, the lodge remains the oldest Masonic building in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Also, as many of us know, it was its association with the Free and Accepted Masons that prevented the lodge from being destroyed during the burning of Chambersburg in 1864. Having withstood that assault and standing the test of time, George Washington Lodge No. 143 was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1976. Prior to that achievement, a small addition was added to the rear of the building at the time of its 150th anniversary, in 1966.

In more ways than one George Washington Lodge No. 143 represents the story of our country and I am proud to commemorate the 200th year of its institution.

IN RECOGNITION OF ZINGERMAN'S
COMMUNITY OF BUSINESS**HON. DEBBIE DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Zingerman's Community of Businesses on receiving the Ann Arbor Jewish Family Services Bernstein Award. Zingerman's is an Ann Arbor institution which has become known around the world. It is an honor and privilege to recognize this renowned, successful and socially conscious business and to share with my colleagues not only the great work they have done for the Washtenaw County community and their thousands of visitors from across the country every year, but to highlight their leadership as well.

The Jewish Family Services Bernstein Award is given out each year to individuals or businesses who display exceptional local leadership in the Washtenaw County community. Zingerman's Community of Businesses are part of the fabric of the Ann Arbor area and have grown into a recognizable international name. Since its creation in 1982 by Paul Saginaw and Ari Weinzwieg, Zingerman's has delivered quality food products to the people of Ann Arbor and to their thousands of patrons every year from around the world. Not only have they delivered delicious, quality products through their deli, creamery, coffee company, bakehouse, and candy factory, but they have stayed true to sourcing fresh and local ingredients. Zingerman's operates Cornman farms to produce pesticide free vegetables and free range livestock for all of their restaurants.

Not enough to provide great baked goods to their customers, they built a teaching kitchen to help instruct home bakers of all skill levels from those who have never broken an egg to the most accomplished who want to learn more. Most unique about Zingerman's is its approach to employees and the business. Since their beginning, they have always paid wages above the federal minimum wage and offered company-subsidized health care and paid time off. They care about their employees and communities. They have taken their unique culture and are teaching the "Zingerman's experience" to forward thinking organizations around the world, helping clients make meaningful bottom line enhancing changes in their own organizations.

Some have observed that Zingerman's is better known outside of Ann Arbor than in its community. For those that live in Washtenaw County, Zingerman's is an iconic location to buy fresh food and produce or get a great meal, but they are also known for being heavily involved in the community. To this day, there are people in Washtenaw County that struggle to afford food and many go hungry. The Zingerman's family has been dedicated to fighting hunger since 1988.

They have helped to create the Food Gatherers nonprofit food rescue program and food bank and annually the Zingerman's Community of Businesses contributes as a major corporate contributor. They also teach seminars on how to manage and develop a business so that young entrepreneurs across the country can learn from their success. This type of engagement has set a powerful example to other businesses in our area, showing that you can

be successful and do the right thing, every day. Zingerman's goal in 2020 is to leave the world better than it was when they came here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to recognize Zingerman's Community of Businesses and owners Paul Saginaw and Ari Weinzwieg on receiving the Jewish Family Services Bernstein Award, for their enormous contributions to our region, and for continued success in all of their ventures.

HONORING THE CAREER OF JUDGE
MARCUS D. GORDON**HON. TRENT KELLY**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Marcus D. Gordon was born on October 22, 1931, in Union, Mississippi. In 1950, he graduated from Union High School and attended East Central Community College on a football and basketball scholarship. In January 1951, he enlisted in the United States Air Force and served in the Korean War. After four years of service, he returned to Mississippi and re-enrolled in East Central Community College. While attending East Central Community College, Judge Gordon continued to play on the football and basketball teams and received All-State honors.

Judge Gordon then attended the University of Mississippi and earned a bachelor's degree in business administration and his law degree from the University of Mississippi School of Law. He was admitted to the Mississippi bar, and returned home to open a private law practice with his brother, Rex Gordon, Sr. In 1971, he was elected to be the District Attorney for the Eighth Circuit Court Judicial District. He was later appointed by Governor Cliff Finch as Circuit Court Judge for the Eighth Circuit Court Judicial District. Judge Gordon served as Circuit Court Judge until 1987.

After briefly returning to a private law firm, he was elected in 1990 to serve again as Circuit Court Judge. He served in that position until March 4, 2016, having served as a Circuit Court Judge for 38 years. During his tenure, Judge Gordon maintained a distinguished record of judicial integrity, character, service, and excellence. He was known for his fairness and high ethical standards, but also for his quick wit and astuteness when the occasion warranted a lighter moment.

Most importantly, Judge Gordon is a proud husband, father, and grandfather. He has been married to his wife, Mrs. Polly Gordon, for 60 years and together they have four children and two grandchildren. I would like to thank Judge Gordon for his dedicated service to our state and his contributions to improving the judicial system.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE 100TH
BIRTHDAY OF MRS. ANGELINE A.
"ANGIE" KOPKA**HON. ANN M. KUSTER**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of one of my most distinguished

and active constituents, Mrs. Angeline A. "Angie" Kopka, on her 100th birthday; she is a beloved member of the Nashua community that I am proud to represent in Congress. We commemorate Angie's birthday inspiration as she is a true example of what has made the Granite State such a strong and vibrant place.

Angie is a former member of the New Hampshire House of Representatives, serving her state from 2002 until 2010. In 2012, she won re-election and returned to the State House as the oldest lawmaker in the United States, a true indicator of her dedication to public service. In addition, Angie is the founder of Kopka Real Estate, based in Nashua, New Hampshire. As a real estate agent, she served as the president of the National Women's Council of Realtors and the New Hampshire Association of Realtors. In 1991, she won the National Association of Realtors Distinguished Service Award. Angie not only had a successful career, but has enjoyed a rich personal life. She was married to her lifelong partner, John Kopka, Jr. Together, they raised two children, seven grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize the 100th birthday of one of New Hampshire's most engaged citizens, Mrs. Angeline A. "Angie" Kopka. I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in celebrating this proud milestone in her remarkable life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained and missed four votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on Roll Call No. 141, "no" on Roll Call No. 142, "no" on Roll Call No. 143, and "no" on Roll Call No. 144.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on April 12, 2016 and missed the following votes. Had I been present I would have voted:

On Roll Call Vote 139, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 1567, the Global Food Security Act of 2016, I would have voted Yes.

On Roll Call Vote 140, On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 4676, the Preventing Crimes Against Veterans Act of 2016, I would have voted Yes.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON'S CAMERON
BURRELL SETS NCAA
RECORD**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Cameron Burrell of Houston,

Texas for setting the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) record for the 60-meter dash.

Cameron is a graduate of Ridge Point High School in Missouri City, Texas who brought his talent as a sprinter to the Cougars at the University of Houston. As a junior, Burrell ran the 60-meter dash in 6.50 seconds, setting the second fastest time in the world for 2016. In addition to this, he also qualified for the NCAA Indoor Championships. The 60-meter dash was held at Birmingham CrossPlex in Birmingham, Alabama. Cameron broke not only the University of Houston's school record, but also beat LSU Alumnus Richard Thompson's 2008 record of 6.51 seconds. We are so proud of Cameron and can't wait to see where his talent takes him.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Cameron Burrell for setting the NCAA record for the 60-meter dash. Keep up the hard work.

HONORING THE LATE RANDY
NAYLOR, SR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a philanthropist, the late Randy Naylor, Sr. Mr. Naylor has shown what can be done through hard work, setting goals, and aiming high.

Randy Naylor, Sr. was born June 23, 1953, in Vicksburg, MS to George Washington and Lillian B. Naylor. He was a humble and caring man who was always in good spirit.

Randy was a graduate of Rosa A. Temple High School Class of 1973, where he served as a Drum Major. He also attended Hinds Community College where he studied Criminal Justice.

Randy was employed with Vicksburg Warren School System as a bus driver and ISD teacher. He also worked nights at the Merchant Company as well as a security guard for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He joined the Vicksburg Police Department in 1988. Randy was the recipient of the "Officer of the Year" award on numerous occasions. He had extensive training in all aspects of law enforcement, criminal and juvenile investigation. In 2008, Randy was elected Constable for Warren County where he served until his death. Naylor was also a Notary Public for the state of Mississippi.

Randy volunteered his time to the Salvation Army, Kings Head Start, which he later adopted and provided clothes and books to the kids at the center. He also volunteered at the River City Rescue Mission. Randy spoke to various youth groups at churches throughout the city.

Randy also worked diligently with the city summer program, "Street Ball" which is now called the Randy Naylor Summer Youth Program. He secured various partnerships throughout the city for supplies for the program. Mr. Naylor's work as a Resource officer in the Vicksburg/Warren School District allowed him to develop good relationships with the youth that made his impact on the "Street Ball" program extremely important in the realm of community policing. Students and young

people would listen to him when no other officer could get them to cooperate. Parents trusted him with their kids and criminals knew better than to cross him, all because of the relationships he built through his work in the community.

As a member of Calvary Baptist Church he served as an Usher and the president of the Layman's Ministry. He was married to Dorothy Naylor for 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the late Mr. Randy Naylor, Sr. for his dedication to serving our great city in the Vicksburg/Warren community.

FIRSTBANK

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud FirstBank for receiving the Pioneer Award from the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation.

The Pioneer Award is given annually to a Jefferson County company that demonstrates an ability to keep up with today's rapidly changing global economy and makes significant contributions to Jefferson County's economy.

As one of Lakewood's largest employers, FirstBank is a consumer and commercial lender that has over 115 locations in Colorado, Arizona and California and over \$14 billion in assets. The company is currently adding an additional 127,000 square feet to their headquarters on West Colfax. Upon completion in 2016, the location will house 900 employees with room to expand to 1,300 employees in the coming years. The expansion will enable the company to hire about 70 additional employees over the next year.

I extend my deepest congratulations to FirstBank for this well-deserved recognition by Jefferson County EDC. Thank you for your contributions to the Jefferson County economy and community.

TRIBUTE TO BROOKE MILLER
AXIOTIS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Brooke Miller Axiotis for being named a 2016 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2016 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 640 business leaders and growing.

As a Civil Rights Specialist and housing investigator on the Iowa Civil Rights Commission, Brooke is heavily involved in her community. She is dedicated to serving others and does so through public service. She currently serves her community on the Iowa State Board of Education, the National Association of State Boards of Education, the Junior League of Des Moines Board, as well as the Urban Ag Academy Board. She is committed to staying engaged in her community and that is a true testament to her character and Iowa values.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Brooke in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Brooke on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2016 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

HONORING PAMELA STUART ON
THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT FROM TEACHING

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pamela Stuart, who is retiring this year after a distinguished career as a public school teacher in Mississippi. As the Representative of the Second District of the State of Mississippi, I have the honor and privilege of getting to know some exceptional community leaders. Pamela Stuart, who originally hails from Philadelphia, Mississippi, is one of them. Pam came of age during the Civil Rights movement in Mississippi and her life was shaped by these events. Like my own calling early in my career, Pam's calling was teaching and her passion was sharing what we could learn from the past to improve the future. As a high school U.S. history teacher, Pam shaped young minds throughout her dedicated career.

I was honored to visit Pam's class at Clinton High School in 2008 and was impressed by her students' engagement in civics and in understanding how our shared history shapes our society and our vision for creating a continuously stronger and better condition for all Americans. Pam's students rank her among their most influential teachers and a lasting mentor whose contributions and commitment impacted their scholarship, their careers, and their lives as involved members of their communities.

Many of her students have gone on to become leaders in their fields in their own right. A true testament to my confidence in the products of her teaching, I hired one of her students who served on my Committee staff for more than eight years.

This month, Pamela Stuart retires from a storied career as an exceptional school teacher. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Pam for her invaluable service to her community, the state of Mississippi, and our nation. Her contributions have clearly made an enduring impact on the countless lives and minds she has helped shape.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$19,234,006,195,713.79. We've added \$8,607,129,146,800.71 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING DR. HENRY C. LEE ON THE CELEBRATION OF HIS 40TH ANNIVERSARY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAVEN

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to join the University of New Haven as they celebrate and pay tribute to one of our nation's great minds, Dr. Henry C. Lee. Known as the "grandfather of forensic science," Dr. Lee has left an indelible mark on the field of forensic science, the University of New Haven, and our nation.

A nationally and internationally acknowledged visionary, Dr. Lee has built a distinguished reputation while creating one of the most respected forensic science programs in the country. Under his leadership, forensic studies have grown exponentially over the last forty years at the University of New Haven. What began as a small classroom equipped with only a single fingerprinting kit has blossomed into an internationally-recognized, multi-disciplined academic department with state-of-the-art technology—an Institute of Forensic Science named in his honor. Attracting students from across the globe, the Henry C. Lee Institute of Forensic Science is training the next generation of forensic scientists and constantly advancing the field as well as the technologies and techniques used in identifying crucial evidence.

Dr. Lee's extraordinary career extends far beyond the forensic program he built at the University of New Haven. He earned his undergraduate degree in police science from Central Police College in Taiwan, a Bachelor's of Science degree in forensic science from John Jay College of Criminal Justice, and then his master's degree and doctoral degree in biochemistry from New York University. He joined the Connecticut State police more than three decades ago serving as the State's first criminologist. The driving force behind the creation of the Connecticut State Police Major Crime Squad and Forensic Science Laboratory, he oversaw its expansion into one of the finest in the country. Dr. Lee also served as the Commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Public Safety from 1998 to 2000, during which time he brought the department to the forefront of technology with the development of a new radio system and the Sex Offender Registry Database.

Dr. Lee has served as a forensic expert in all fifty states as well as forty-two countries and consulted with more than 600 law enforcement agencies around the world. Here in the United States he is probably best-known for his assistance with the investigations into the high-profile cases of the deaths of JonBenet Ramsey, Nicole Brown-Simpson, and Ron Goldman, as well as the review of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. However, those are only a sample of the more than 8,000 criminal cases he has helped investigate.

Dr. Lee has authored or co-authored forty books and hundreds of articles in professional journals; taught at more than a dozen universities, law schools and medical schools; and lectured throughout the world. His innovation and leadership has been recognized with more than 20 honorary degrees, and, in 1996, he was awarded the Medal of Justice from the Justice Foundation. Today, as he marks his 40th Anniversary with the University of New Haven I am proud to join his colleagues, family, and friends, in extending my sincere congratulations to Dr. Henry C. Lee and my sincere thanks and appreciation for his innumerable contributions to higher education and the field of forensic science.

APPRECIATING SOLICITOR DONNIE MYERS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the recent retirement announcement by 11th Judicial Circuit Solicitor Donnie Myers began an outpouring of appreciation for his dedicated service. South Carolina maintains the terminology of its English heritage by citing the position of district attorney as solicitor.

In addition to effectively protecting families from predators, he was especially prudent in recruiting young attorneys who excelled at serving the public.

He was recognized in an abbreviated editorial on March 24, 2016, in the Lexington County Chronicle and the The Dispatch-News entitled "The end of a 40-year career in court" by Editor Jerry Bellune:

Donald V. Myers, the nemesis of death penalty defendants, is ending a 40-year career in 11th Circuit courts.

As capital murder cases go, it has been one of the most dramatic careers in state history.

Facing a state law-mandated retirement age of 72 next year, Myers decided there's no point in seeking re-election with only 11 months left to serve.

That would force taxpayers to bear the cost of an election to fill the rest of his term, he said.

Myers' wife Vance urged him to go to law school and join her father's law practice in Gaffney.

After prosecuting cases for Attorney General Dan McLeod, an opportunity presented itself when 11th Circuit Solicitor Phil Wingard unexpectedly died.

Myers ran to serve the rest of Wingard's term and has not faced a challenger since.

Myers' life and career have been far from smooth. He and his wife had one child, Chris, although they had been told she could not bear children.

Chris had a rare health condition but that did not slow him.

He and his father were inseparable. Chris went along with his father to courtrooms around the four-county circuit.

On Valentine's Day in 2003, Chris's condition proved fatal.

It was a tragedy for their family. Friends overflowed the old Lexington County Courthouse for a memorial service.

Tragedy struck again three years later. His wife Vance, who had a law degree and was her husband's consultant on capital cases, died unexpectedly.

Myers was shattered by the loss of his son and wife in such a short period of time . . .

Myers said he looks forward to retirement, fishing and a few writing projects he has in mind.

We appreciate all he did to help victims of violent crimes.

Prominent attorneys have also joined praising his service with a letter to the editor on March 31, 2016, by Pat McWhirter entitled "Prosecutor Donnie Myers remains one of the best," which reads:

I was the public defender in Lexington County for 14 years. I began shortly after Donnie Myers became solicitor, and he and I sort of grew up together in those roles.

He is an excellent solicitor, honest, forthcoming and reasonable, but tough.

He also is one of the best trial lawyers I have ever seen in a courtroom. He is, and I feel certain will remain, a legend among solicitors in this state.

He has done an outstanding job for the 11th Judicial Circuit, and we will miss him.

When we see him, we should thank him for his work. He will be hard to replace.

COMPETITIVE CARRIERS ASSOCIATION AND HANDS ON NASHVILLE DAY OF SERVICE

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a wonderful event that took place Tuesday afternoon in Nashville, Tennessee. Members of the Competitive Carriers Association (CCA), representing rural and competitive wireless carriers and their vendors and suppliers, opened CCA's Mobile Carriers Show. They did this by teaming with Hands On Nashville for a day of service at Napier Elementary School.

Seventy-five volunteers from all over the country were welcomed by Principal Watechia Lawless to help create beautiful spaces outside of the school to complement the loving community on the inside. Napier Elementary is a cornerstone in their community, serving 400 students from pre-kindergarten through the 4th grade. CCA members worked inside and outside, landscaping, renovating playground equipment, painting murals, and creating teaching resource kits, hygiene kits, and reading booklets for every child in the school.

I commend Steve Berry, CCA and their members for their work. They have set an excellent example of leadership through service. The impact they've made in this community will certainly not be forgotten and I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging the efforts they put forth to make this event happen.

HONORING SUNFLOWER COUNTY
FREEDOM PROJECT

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable organization, Sunflower County Freedom Project.

Founded in 1998, the Sunflower County Freedom Project was started by three Teach for America teachers who saw a need for an educational program in the Mississippi Delta that would challenge and engage young people in the area. Initially, the organization was a summer program at Mississippi Delta Community College that grew into a year-round program at the University of Mississippi. In 2002, the organization purchased the LEAD Center in Sunflower, which houses all of their programs. They target students in Sunflower County to complete a six-year fellowship with the organization beginning with the summer before they begin seventh grade. The overall goal is to have 100 percent of their "fellows", also known as students, go on to enroll in four year colleges and universities. To this date they have met that goal.

The Freedom Project is for students in 7th–12th grade who want to discipline themselves into becoming leaders in their homes, schools and communities. The middle school students partake in Freedom Summer, which is named for and rooted in the Civil Rights history of Freedom Summer '64. The high school students can participate in ACT Camp or summer opportunities around the country including Phillips Exeter Summer Academy and Explo at Yale University.

We seek to provide students with opportunities and challenges that will allow them to grow and mature into leaders for the Mississippi Delta. Our multi-faceted approach includes rigorous academic work, arts enrichment, fitness and wellness training, educational travel and character development for every student. We travel the country, live in college dorm rooms, and camp in the wilderness to develop our students and enrich their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Sunflower County Freedom Project for its dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

PREMIUM PANELS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Premium Panel for receiving a Business Recognition Award from the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation.

The Business Recognition Award is given to companies that show growth in primary employment, sales and/or capital investment in the last year. Premium Panels is a family-owned and operated metal roofing manufacturer and custom sheet metal fabricator in Arvada. The company specializes in concealed

fastener standing seam metal roofing panels, wall panels and also provides aggregate panels.

In 2015, Premium Panels expanded to a 30,000 square foot facility in Arvada and has more than doubled the size of its manufacturing facility space and employment.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Premium Panels for this well-deserved recognition by Jefferson County EDC. Thank you for your contributions to the Jefferson County economy and community.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FUTURE
SCIENTISTS AND TECH-
NOLOGISTS—MICHAEL SPORKIN

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Michael Sporkin from Katy, TX for being accepted into the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists to represent the state of Texas at the Congress of Future Science and Technology leaders.

Michael attends Cinco Ranch High School and is one of 13 high school honor students selected from the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas. These students were selected as Texas delegates at the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders. This program was designed for high school students to be recognized for their hard work in school, as well as to support their aspirations of working in a science or technology field. The National Academy was founded by Richard Rossi and Dr. Robert Darling; Mr. Rossi currently serves as president. The Congress is being held at the Tsongas Center at the University of Massachusetts, Lowell from June 29th through July 1st. Michael was selected by a group of educators to be a delegate for the Congress thanks to his dedication to his academic success and goals of pursuing science or technology. We are proud of Michael and all of his hard work, and know he will make Katy proud.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Michael for being accepted into the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists. Keep up the great work.

TRIBUTE TO DYLAN LAMPE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Dylan Lampe for being named a 2016 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based

on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2016 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 640 business leaders and growing.

As the Manager of Administration Training and Quality Control at the Sammons Financial group, Dylan is responsible for improving the practices and training of his division. He is dedicated to providing a work environment where his co-workers can be happy and enjoy coming to work every day. Dylan is also passionate about giving back to his community and serves on a number of boards and committees including: Winefest Des Moines, Des Moines Community Playhouse, Downtown Neighborhood Association, and Food Bank of Iowa, to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Dylan in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Dylan on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2016 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

BORINQUENEERS CONGRESSIONAL
GOLD MEDAL AWARD

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the privilege of participating in the Congressional Gold Medal Ceremony in honor of the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers. I want to once again express my most heartfelt congratulations to the Regiment on this important and long overdue recognition.

This all-volunteer Puerto Rican unit, of more than 100,000 soldiers, served in World War I, World War II, and the Korean War. The Borinqueneers have been recognized with one Medal of Honor, 10 Distinguished Service Crosses, more than 250 Silver Stars, over 600 Bronze Stars, and nearly 3,000 Purple Hearts. Yesterday, they receive the highest award Congress can bestow.

Hundreds of these veterans and their families have made my district in Central Florida their home. I am honored to have been a co-sponsor of the legislation that finally awarded them the Congressional Gold Medal. I am also proud to have urged the President to expedite the striking of their Medal, and in accordance with Public Law No. 113–120, a single gold medal was struck to honor the 65th Infantry Regiment.

This medal honors the lives of soldiers like Richard Acosta, a resident of my district. Originally from Arroyo, Puerto Rico, Mr. Acosta bravely fought on the front lines during the Battle of Outpost Kelly in Korea. He recounts how he almost lost his life when his rifle jammed in the middle of the battle and when he went to go inform his Lieutenant, he felt the whizzing sound of bullets that narrowly passed within inches of his head. Immediately taking cover, Mr. Acosta continued to battle without a

rifle until he was able to reach his Lieutenant to get a new one.

Similarly, the Freytes-Ménendez Brothers, Celio, Erasto, and Anibal, were among the first U.S. troops to engage the enemy when they landed in Korea. Dennis Freytes, son of Celio Freytes-Ménendez and an advocate for veterans in my district, recounts how his father, who served in World War II and Korea, survived a mortar shot that landed in a foxhole he had just left, which sadly killed four of his fellow Borinqueneers. For his heroism, Freytes-Ménendez was awarded the Combat Infantryman Badge and the Bronze Star for Valor.

I've heard countless stories of many brave Borinqueneers who did not come back home. Rafael Sanchez Saliva, whose family lives in my district, served in the 65th Infantry Regiment in Puerto Rico and later in the U.S. Army Ranger Regiment. He served two tours in Korea and was tragically killed in action by a tank mine while serving in Vietnam.

Puerto Ricans have fought for the United States as far back as the American Revolution, and continue to do so honorably to this day. Thousands have given their lives defending our values of freedom, justice, and equality, despite enduring decades of segregation and second-class treatment.

It was a privilege to have joined the Borinqueneers on a day of recognition and remembrance as our nation honored their pioneering military service, devotion to duty, and many acts of valor in the face of adversity.

HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to law enforcement men and women who have provided distinctive service to the people of Florida's 16th Congressional District.

Law enforcement is a demanding profession that requires sacrifice, courage and a dedication to serve others. Every day, brave men and women put themselves in harm's way to enforce the laws of our society and protect public safety. They deserve our gratitude and respect.

Five years ago, I established the 16th District Congressional Law Enforcement Awards, CLEA, to give special recognition to law enforcement officers, departments, or units for exceptional achievement.

This year, I will present congressional law enforcement awards to the following winners chosen by an independent panel comprised of current and retired law enforcement personnel representing a cross-section of the district's law enforcement community.

Deputy Billie Wilson of the Manatee County Sheriff's Office and Officer Kenneth Simunovic of the Bradenton Police Department will receive the Above and Beyond the Call of Duty Award.

Officer Tim Matthews of the Palmetto Police Department, Officer Michael Walker of the Holmes Beach Police Department, Sergeant Demetri Konstantopoulos of the Sarasota Police Department, Sergeant Donald Kennard of the Sarasota County Sheriff's Office and Detective Jason Friday will receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

Lieutenant Johnny Yong of the Sarasota County Sheriff's Office, Sergeant Matt Kintigh of the North Port Police Department and Trooper Barbara Ehrhart of the Florida Highway Patrol will receive the Career Service Award.

The following Members of the Sarasota Police Department's Homeless Outreach Team: Captain Kevin Stiff, Lieutenant Lori Jaress, Sergeant Michael "Richie" Schwieterman, Officers David Dubendorf, Matthew Kimball, Matthew Grochowski, Jonathan Misiewicz along with Case Managers Sherree Brown, Calvin Collins and Joseph Polzak will receive the Unit Citation Award.

Officer John Parisi of the North Port Police Department will receive the Preservation of Life Award.

Leaders of the Harvest House in Sarasota; Pastor Jim Minor and Executive Director Erin Minor will receive the Associate Service Award.

STOPPING RUSSIAN AGGRESSION AGAINST NATO ALLIES

HON. THOMAS MACARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight a disturbing trend that deserves increased scrutiny in the wake of Russia's growing aggression on its southern and western borders. Recently, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg met with members of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees to discuss how to counter an assertive Russia, a phenomenon he describes as "a chief threat."

Recent events have led some to question the relevance of the NATO alliance. Indeed, designations that NATO is obsolete have sparked an international debate about the significance of the 28-member defense alliance—one that has drawn the focus of our nation's top military leaders who have been stalwart in their defense of its importance.

Russia's aggression has also put increased pressure on our NATO ally Turkey. In recent years Turkey has witnessed aggression to its north in Crimea and Ukraine, to the south in Syria, and in Georgia to its east. This has all been part of a larger Russian strategy to put pressure on NATO's perimeter in an attempt to solidify regional control.

Turkey lies in the invaluable strategic location as the gateway between Europe and the Middle East. Now is the time for the United States to show strong support for all of our NATO allies, and especially Turkey. Vladimir Putin understands only one thing and this is strength. If we don't stand with our allies now and show strength, then Putin will continue to display regional aggression and ultimately may threaten one of our NATO allies. We must stand with our allies now, more than ever, to ensure that security in the region is maintained and U.S. interests are secured.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF TYRONE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the Tyrone Chamber of Commerce of Tyrone, Pennsylvania. The Chamber, which was started as the Tyrone Business Men's Association, today boasts 207 members and continues to grow.

Since its founding, the Tyrone Chamber has been instrumental in advancing countless infrastructure projects and backing the World Metric Standardization Act. Other achievements include introducing a higher standard of education in the borough and improving school playground equipment, train facilities, and critical surface transportation infrastructure.

Thanks to the Chamber, Tyrone was able to secure the Reliance of Manufacturing Company in 1933 and the Chicago Rivet and Machine Company in 1948. More recently, the organization has assisted with opening the branch office of the Blair County Motor Club (A.A.A.), erecting the "Welcome to Tyrone" signs at the entrances into Tyrone, and sponsoring the Tyrone Community Improvement Association in its efforts in the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce sponsored Community Development contest. Their motto from 1916 still rings true today, as the Chamber truly does work for a "Bigger and Better and Busier Tyrone."

It gives me great pleasure to recognize the 100-year history and the promising future of the Tyrone Chamber of Commerce. I know that in the years ahead, they will continue to serve the community proudly and advance the commercial, industrial, agricultural and civic interests of Tyrone.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN DAVID A. CHASE, AS HE PREPARES TO RETIRE AFTER 30 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND TO OUR NATION

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the incredible service of Captain David A. Chase, as he prepares to retire after 30 years of Commissioned Service to the United States Navy and for his extraordinary dedication to duty and to the United States of America.

I have worked with Captain Chase personally over the past three years in his capacity as Director of the Navy Appropriations Matters Office (FMBE) in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller), and I would like to share some highlights of his fine career.

Captain Chase graduated from the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1986 with a Bachelor of Arts in Economics and received his commission through

the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps program. He also holds Masters Degrees from the Naval War College and National Defense University Eisenhower School. During his illustrious Naval career, he commanded the Mine Countermeasures Ship USS Avenger (MCM 1) from 1999–2001, Guided Missile Frigate USS Vandegrift (FFG 48) from 2004–2006 and was the Commodore of a squadron of fourteen mine warfare ships, their crews, and a command staff of 85. Highlights of his Command tours include deployments to the Mediterranean, Persian Gulf, and Western Pacific, operating with Kitty Hawk Strike Group as part of the Japan-based Forward Deployed Naval Forces, and preparing ready and capable mine warfare ships and trained crews to support Seventh and Fifth Fleet operations.

He also served with distinction in a variety of assignments ashore: Flag Aide to Commander Naval Base San Francisco/Commander Logistics Group One; Financial Analyst on the OPNAV staff (Surface Warfare Directorate), where he was responsible for developing shipbuilding budgets; and as a Politico-Military Planner for the Strategic Plans and Policy Directorate, Joint Staff (J5), where he developed and oversaw Theater Security Cooperation activities in Pacific Command area of operations. His efforts helped to build and strengthen America's ties with our Southeast Asian partners and allies at a critical time in our nation's history.

In his current assignment as the Director of Navy Appropriations Matters Office, during a time of significant readiness and manpower challenges, he demonstrated exceptional leadership and foresight, engaging Members of the Appropriations Committee and its staff to provide information essential to resourcing the Navy for its role as the world's dominant sea power. In an increasingly difficult budget environment, Captain Chase provided essential support in shepherding four Navy budgets through the appropriations process. He served our Navy and nation with integrity, insight and dedication. My office, the subcommittee staff, and I have found him to be a pleasure to work with and respect his professionalism.

There is a saying in the United States Navy when a person retires that "this sailor stood the watch," and today, Mr. Speaker, I ask you and Members of the House to join me in saluting my friend, Captain David A. Chase, for a job well done. He has faithfully stood the watch all these years and now his watch stands relieved. To Dave, his wife Caroline, and his three children Kirsten, Evan, and Sophie, we wish them "Fair Winds and Following Seas."

TRIBUTE TO IZAAH JB KNOX

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Izaah JB Knox for being named a 2016 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an

impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2016 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 640 business leaders and growing.

Izaah serves as the Associate Executive Director at Urban Dreams as well as the Talent Acquisition Program Development Consultant at Wellmark Blue Cross Blue Shield. He has been tirelessly dedicated throughout his career to providing the next generation of young people with opportunities that will allow them to achieve their goals and become successful. He also has served his community through his involvement in a number of boards and commissions as well as volunteering for local organizations. His willingness to serve others is a true testament to his character as well as his lowa values.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Izaah in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Izaah on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2016 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FUTURE SCIENTISTS AND TECHNOLOGISTS—JARED HOLLOWAY

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jared Holloway from Richmond, TX for being accepted into the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists to represent the state of Texas at the Congress of Future Science and Technology leaders.

Jared is one of 13 high school honor students selected from the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas. These students were selected as Texas delegates at the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders. This program was designed for high school students to be recognized for their hard work in school, as well as to support their aspirations of working in a science or technology field. The National Academy was founded by Richard Rossi and Dr. Robert Darling; Mr. Rossi currently serves as president. The Congress is being held at the Tsongas Center at the University of Massachusetts, Lowell from June 29th through July 1st. Jared was selected by a group of educators to be a delegate for the Congress thanks to his dedication to his academic success and goals of pursuing science or technology. We are proud of Jared and all of his hard work, and know he will make Richmond proud.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Jared for being accepted into the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists. Keep up the great work.

HONORING MRS. FLORINE LEWIS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Unsung Hero, Mrs. Florine Lewis.

For some retired educators, retirement means a time to relax and take it easy. Not for longtime Holmes County, Mississippi resident, Mrs. Florine Lewis. She served the Second Congressional District as an outstanding educator for 37 years. Now retired for 15 years, she is still going like the "Energizer Bunny."

Mrs. Lewis continues to actively serve her community. She volunteers at the UMC Hospital of Holmes County; is active in the Holmes County Teachers Association, the Mississippi Valley State University Holmes County Alumni Chapter, and in her church, Asia Missionary Baptist Church of Lexington. She annually serves as a Spelling Bee judge for the Community Students Learning Center's Spelling Bee contest in which she has received several awards. "I am just always willing to serve where I can and when I can," she said.

In addition to her busy community service, Mrs. Lewis is also the principal caregiver for her elderly mother, who lives miles away in Greenville, Miss.

The Itta Bena, Mississippi native began her teaching career at Montgomery Elementary School in Mount Bayou, Mississippi and later relocated to Holmes County where she has taught at the former Tchula Attendance Center (TAC) and the Holmes County Vocational Center. She is the widow of the late Robert Earl Lewis, who was also a principal and teacher in Holmes County. The two of them have six children who are adults in various professions such as teaching, librarian, business and engineering. During her own teaching career, Mrs. Lewis was recognized as a STAR teacher.

Former students and community members alike say that whenever they see Mrs. Lewis, she always greeted them as "Florine Lewis." She just keeps on going and going and going . . . doing what she can to help others, never looking for anything in return. She is truly an unsung hero.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Florine Lewis for her dedication in serving the community.

IN MEMORY OF JOHN MCKIBBIN

HON. JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a beloved resident of Southwest Washington, John McKibbin. John was a respected leader and a dedicated community member whose life made a lasting impact on our region.

Respected for his ability to bring people together, John was a lifelong servant. He began his career as a teacher at Columbia River High School and went on to serve in the Washington State House of Representatives,

and then as a Clark County Commissioner. However, John's commitment to his community did not end after leaving public office. As a business leader, he continued to dedicate his time and effort to the community he so proudly represented until the end of his life.

John was a bright light in his hometown of Vancouver. He participated in numerous volunteer projects and civic organizations including Leadership Clark County, Evergreen Habitat for Humanity, and the Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce. John's relentless energy, tireless passion, and genuine positivity spoke to how deeply he cared for his local community.

Today, I want to honor John and the legacy of leadership he leaves behind. His dedication to making life better for the people in our region, and his love for his home will endure and serve as examples to those who strive to make our community a better place to live.

I pray for peace for John's family during this difficult time.

COLORADO CHRISTIAN
UNIVERSITY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Colorado Christian University (CCU) as the Economic Developer of the Year and winner of the Genesis Award from the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation.

The Genesis Award and Economic Developer of the Year honors a private individual, elected official, city, company or organization that has contributed to economic vitality of Jefferson County. A private Christian university, CCU has an enrollment of 6,000 students and currently offers more than 100 undergraduate and graduate degree programs for traditional and adult students.

Currently, CCU is in the middle of a six-year, \$120 million redevelopment to increase the number of students and faculty on campus and contribute to the overall economy of Lakewood. The expansion project will increase the campus from 150,000 sq. ft. to more than 400,000 sq. ft. and will allow for up to 1,800 student enrollments.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Colorado Christian University for this well-deserved recognition by Jefferson County EDC. Thank you for your contributions to the Jefferson County economy and community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH AN-
NIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL
COLLEGIATE HONORS COUNCIL

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the House floor to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the National Collegiate Honors Council. The NCHC, which is dedicated to achieving excellence in education in diverse subject and curriculum areas, represents over

800 colleges and universities around the country and over 800,000 honors students.

I would also like to honor Lane Community College, in my district, on their membership in the National Collegiate Honors Council. After joining the Council in 2011, the college was able to establish multiple honors classes in various disciplines in order to promote a liberal education approach. Striving to implement an honorary program displays the motivation to up the academic standards of Lane Community College and compete with other institutions. Members of this honor program conduct undergraduate research, which is later shared with the campus community and public in an academic symposium each spring. Several findings from these research studies have been used by both the college and community.

As graduates of this prestigious honor program, students from Lane Community College often receive scholarships and transfer to various institutions in order to complete their degree at a higher level of competency. These same students go on to become the future leaders of America.

Congratulations to the National Collegiate Honors Council on its 50th anniversary and to Lane Community College on their continued success in providing exceptional education opportunities for their students.

TRIBUTE TO MR. ROBERT (BOB)
SIMPSON

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Robert Simpson, an outstanding labor leader who is being honored by the Chicago Chapter of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists for a life time of dedicated service and commitment to labor union development and progressive causes. Bob's career began in the City of Chicago as a Montgomery Ward Catalog House employee in 1952. In 1953, he began actively organizing employees at Montgomery Ward, served as Union Steward and became a member of the negotiating committee. His union organizing activities were interrupted by two years of service in the U.S. Army Signal Corp. and he was sent to Germany.

In 1962, Bob was elected as Trustee of Local 743 and assigned as an organizer; in 1966 he became Director of Organizing for Local 743 and in 1972 he became Recording Secretary for Local 743. In 1972, Bob was elected President of the Chicago Chapter of the CBTU and Corresponding Secretary and Executive Council of the International Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, a title which he currently holds. In 1983, Bob was Co-Chairman of organized labor's support for Harold Washington for Mayor of Chicago, in 1984, he was elected Vice President of Local 743, in 1985 arrested in Washington, D.C., demonstrating against Apartheid in South Africa, in 1988 elected President of Teamster Local 743, the largest local in the International Teamsters representing 23,000 members.

In 1990 Bob became an International Brotherhood of Teamsters Trustee, in 1994 co-leader of the U.S. Labor Leaders Delegation to ob-

serve the first historic South African Election Affiliates. He was a National Board Member of Operation Push, Board Member of the Teamsters Black Caucus, Little City Foundation, NAACP, A. Philip Randolph Institute and Co-leader of Union Women.

Bob Simpson has never missed a beat; he has served on the transition teams of Secretary of State Jim Ryan and Attorney General Roland Burris, and he was a close confidante of Congressman Charles Hayes and Mayor Harold Washington and introduced President Barack Obama to the National CBTU when he was a State Senator. Since 1952 Bob has been actively involved and engaged in any labor issue, injustice issue or wherever people needed help. He distributes food to needy families, has testified before various legislative and other public bodies, has picketed and been involved with other protest efforts such as Black Friday, Occupy Wall Street and Black Lives Matter. Mr. Robert (Bob) Simpson has been on the Wall for Justice since 1952 and will not come down until his time on this earth is up. What a dedication, what a commitment, what a man and what a life.

HONORING CAPTAIN TIMOTHY A.
BROWN

HON. C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to honor the life and legacy of Captain Timothy A. Brown, a Merchant Marine who served in the Vietnam War and a leader in Maryland's maritime industry. Captain Brown served as International President of the Masters, Mates & Pilots for more than two decades before passing away at the age of 73 while living in Maryland.

Raised in both Ohio and Florida, Captain Brown graduated from the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in 1965. He then joined the Masters, Mates & Pilots (MM&P), splitting his time between shipping and attending Graduate School at the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania, where he was awarded two degrees in 1974.

Captain Brown's first MM&P vessel was the SS *Fruitvale Hills*, sailing as a deck cadet on the SS *Del Oro* for Delta Steamship Lines. He first sailed as master aboard the *Sealand Consumer* for Sealand Service Inc. in 1983. His last command as master was aboard the same vessel in 1991.

He then took on a leadership role with the MM&P as an insurgent candidate, later serving the organization as International President for six terms. Under his guidance, the badly-fractured organization stabilized.

Captain Brown was a passionate advocate and masterful negotiator for the MM&P membership. Thanks to tireless efforts, Captain Brown expanded and improved the healthcare plans offered to members, pensioners and their families.

Upon retiring in 2013, Captain Brown left the organization with a reputation for its professionalism and unity.

Friends describe Captain Brown as generous, thoughtful and open-hearted. He was considered a mentor and father-figure to many young mariners and MM&P staff.

While too numerous to mention in their entirety, Captain Brown's awards and accolades include the Admiral of the Ocean Seas Award and the Father Lalonde Spirit of the Seas Award. He was also admitted to the Port of New York and New Jersey's International Maritime Hall of Fame in 2009 and was named a Commodore of the U.S. Maritime by order of President Barack Obama. He was named President Emeritus of Masters, Mates & Pilots by Delegates to the 84th MM&P Convention.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join with me today to acknowledge the service and dedication of Captain Timothy A. Brown to his country and the entire maritime industry. I humbly express my condolences to his friends and family and wish them peace and comfort in the days ahead.

HONORING THE BIRTHDAY OF
JACQUELINE HARPER DOLD

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish my daughter, Harper Dold, a happy birthday. Harper turns 14 years old today. She was born in Evanston, Illinois and since that day in 2002, has kept me, her mother, Danielle and her younger siblings, Bobby and Honor always on our toes.

Harper was named after Rear Admiral Robert Harper Shumaker, a true American hero that served with the bravest of men, dubbed the Alcatraz Gang, during the Vietnam War. Harper was also named after her Great-Grandmother Jacqueline D'Aversa who immigrated to America from Bari, Italy when she was only 8 years old.

Harper brightens every room she walks into and makes friends with everyone she meets. She enjoys sports and plays competitive soccer and lacrosse. Harper also has many academic achievements and especially excels in her Spanish class.

I am so proud of Harper and all the things she has accomplished—and I can't wait to see what she does next. Happy Birthday, Harper.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD SNIDER

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Ed Snider. Mr. Snider, the founder and owner of the National Hockey League's Philadelphia Flyers and chairman of Comcast-Spectacor, passed away this Monday following a two-year battle with cancer.

Although he was born in Washington, Ed Snider was a true Philadelphia icon. When, in 1964, the NHL announced that they would be adding six new teams, Ed was quick to see the potential for hockey in Philadelphia. His Flyers took the ice in 1967, at first to little fanfare. However, it did not take long for Philadelphians to latch onto their new team. By the time the Flyers won back-to-back Stanley Cups in 1974 and 1975, the city's love for the

game of hockey had been permanently cemented.

Ed has been the face of the Flyers for nearly 50 years, and his passion for the game is reflected in the Flyers teams that took the ice for him. From the Broad Street Bullies to the Legion of Doom line, Ed's squads always represented the tough, blue-collar nature of Philadelphia. A member of the Hockey Hall of Fame's class of 1988, Mr. Snider has also been inducted into the United States Hockey Hall of Fame, the Philadelphia Sports Hall of Fame, and the Philadelphia Jewish Sports Hall of Fame.

Ed's contributions to the city of Philadelphia extend far beyond the doors of the Wells Fargo Center. His Ed Snider Youth Foundation provides after-school, recreational, and supplemental educational activities for children and families in Philadelphia. Thanks to his foundation, countless underprivileged children in Philadelphia and Camden have been afforded the opportunity to learn and play hockey at no cost.

Although he won't be here to see it, Ed's legacy will be on display tonight when the Flyers come to Washington for game one of their Stanley Cup Playoffs series against the Capitals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in honoring the life and memory of Ed Snider.

PAT'S BACKCOUNTRY BEVERAGES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Pat's Backcountry Beverages for receiving the Business Recognition Award from the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation.

The Business Recognition Award is given to companies that show growth in primary employment, sales and/or capital investment in the last year. As a thriving local business, Pat's Backcountry Beverages has developed an innovative hybrid brewing technology that creates a nearly waterless brew concentrate that contains the same flavor of a microbrew. It develops microbrew concentrates and portable beverage carbonators that are environmentally-responsible and durable for backpacking and other outdoor uses. The company specializes in microbrews but recently launched a soda line as well.

Pat's Backcountry Beverages recently expanded in Wheat Ridge into a 17,300 sq. ft. facility, allowing the company to more than double their facility size workforce to 22 employees. The company expects to grow to 30 employees in 2016 and add additional manufacturing capabilities.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Pat's Backcountry Beverages for this well-deserved recognition by Jefferson County EDC. Thank you for your contributions to the Jefferson County economy and community.

TRIBUTE TO JESSICA MALDONADO

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jessica Maldonado for being named a 2016 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2016 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 640 business leaders and growing.

As the Public Affairs Manager at PolicyWorks, a Des Moines based consulting firm, Jessica is dedicated to providing her clients with high quality customer service as well as an outstanding product. She works hand in hand with organizations that are working to build grassroots supports and public awareness on a number of issues. Jessica is also a dedicated member of her community. She volunteers her time to a number of organizations including the Community Connect Mentor Program as well as Variety—The Children's Charity. Her willingness to serve others is a true testament to her character and to her Iowa values.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Jessica in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Jessica on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2016 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FUTURE
SCIENTISTS AND TECH-
NOLOGISTS—DEEPSHIKHA
KARNA

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Deepshikha Karna from Fresno, TX for being accepted into the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists to represent the state of Texas at the Congress of Future Science and Technology leaders.

Deepshikha is one of 13 high school honor students selected from the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas. These students were selected as Texas delegates at the Congress of Future Science and Technology Leaders. This program was designed for high school students to be recognized for their hard work in school, as well as to support their aspirations of working in a science or technology

field. The National Academy was founded by Richard Rossi and Dr. Robert Darling; Mr. Rossi currently serves as president. The Congress is being held at the Tsongas Center at the University of Massachusetts, Lowell from June 29th through July 1st. Deepshikha was selected by a group of educators to be a delegate for the Congress thanks to her dedication to her academic success and goals of pursuing science or technology. We are proud of Deepshikha and all of her hard work, and know she will make Fresno proud.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Deepshikha for being accepted into the National Academy of Future Scientists and Technologists. Keep up the great work.

HONORING LANIER HIGH SCHOOL

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lanier High School. It takes its name from the late, distinguished, William Henry Lanier, a former President of Alcorn College and the first Supervisor of Jackson Colored Public Schools.

Lanier was born a slave in Huntsville, Alabama in 1851. He attended Tougaloo College, Oberlin College and Fisk University and received his B.A. degree from Roger Williams University. He served as president of Alcorn A&M for six years. Lanier taught school in Forest, Winona, Black Hawk, Carrollton, Yazoo City and Jackson. He was principal of the Robertson School from 1912–1929.

Lanier was first organized as a junior-senior high school in 1925, providing instruction for pupils from the seventh through the twelfth grades. A new chapter was added to our history when, on February 8, 1954, they transferred from the old Lanier at 136 East Ash Street and occupied the new Lanier Junior-Senior High School building at 833 West Maple Street. On January 27, 1972, the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals ordered that Lanier School be designated as a center for the enrollment of 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students. In 1991, 9th grade students were added to the enrollment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lanier High School.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 12, 2016, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: "Yes" on roll call vote No. 139 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1567, as amended). "Yes" on roll call vote No. 140 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4676, as amended).

E.L. KENT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
NAMED A 2015 BLUE RIBBON
SCHOOL

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate E.L. Kent Elementary School in Carrollton, Texas, for earning the distinction of being named one of the nation's most successful schools through the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program.

In 1982, the Department of Education established the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program to recognize schools for their high or significantly improved achievement. The program's goal is to identify the methods of thriving American schools to inspire others to imitate their successful practices.

In September of 2015, Secretary of Education Arne Duncan named E.L. Kent Elementary School as a 2015 Blue Ribbon School. Schools selected for national honors reflect high standards and accountability to their students and community. E.L. Kent Elementary School remains committed to enhancing the quality of learning for its students. The tireless work of the school's educators and families cannot go unnoticed, along with the hard work of the students who helped earn this award.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating E.L. Kent Elementary School on its accomplishment as a National Blue Ribbon School.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, on Roll Call 145, I would have voted No.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 75th anniversary of MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa Bay. With much of the world engulfed in conflict in 1939, the War Department selected Tampa to house a new military air field which would go on to become MacDill Air Force Base. With Tampa's natural and strategic location, MacDill has grown and expanded over its 75 years serving as a testament to our nation's military might and Tampa's dedication to supporting the brave men and women of the Armed Services.

Officially activated on April 16, 1941, MacDill trained World War II airmen to fly and operate bombers including the B-17 Flying Fortress and the B-26 Marauder. Throughout

the Second World War, MacDill saw thousands of servicemen train to lead the force in the dangerous skies over Europe. From start to finish, MacDill played a critical role in our country's great military achievement.

After World War II, the bombers gave way to fighters when MacDill became a Tactical Air Command. The turmoil in the 1960s again highlighted the strategic importance of MacDill's location. Throughout the Vietnam War and up until the first Gulf War in 1991, Tampa became a home for the F-4 Phantoms and later F-16 Fighting Falcons. Between 1979 and 1993, about half of all F-16 fighter pilots trained at MacDill Air Force Base.

Currently, MacDill houses the 6th Air Mobility Wing and 39 Mission Teammates, including U.S. Central Command and U.S. Special Operations Command. MacDill is home to more than 13,000 military and civilian personnel and about 170,000 retirees live in the Tampa area and depend on the base for many necessary services. MacDill remains a vital economic driver and a source of good paying jobs for Tampa Bay residents. MacDill extends the global reach of U.S. air power through global air refueling and airlift operations and is a mission our community embraces.

In facing our nation's ongoing and future national security challenges, I am confident that MacDill will continue to play a vital role in protecting the safety of our families and all Americans. Tampa is proud to host and I am honored to represent MacDill Air Force Base every day and today on its 75 year anniversary.

HONORING LILLIE V. DAVIS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Lillie V. Thompson Davis.

Mrs. Lillie V. Thompson Davis, a life time resident of Quitman County, MS, has a strong belief in God; she is a friend to education, a retired school teacher of 42 years, and lives in Marks, MS. She has a teaching experience of more than forty-two years which include seventeen years as assistant principal, Adult Education teacher, teaching in the prison system, and in the state of Indiana. She is a graduate of Rust College Holly Springs, MS and earned a Master of Education from the University of MS Oxford, MS. She was one of the first of four teachers who taught in an integrated school system in an all white school in Marks, MS. Mrs. Davis is an advocate for education and has tutored students in reading and math without a fee, and made generous donations to an educational program. She is sustaining her teaching career as an advanced adult Sunday School teacher at her membership church in Marks, MS.

She initiated the idea to build a much needed gym for the Quitman County Middle School, by the passing of a bond issue. The first attempt to pass the bond issue failed by 23 votes in November of 2013, but because of her fervent prayers, profound determination, and help of many dedicated hard working individuals, the bond issue of four million dollars was tried a second time and passed in November, 2014. She has been a member of

Quitman County School Board since 2006, and has worked untiringly trying to bring about positive changes for the boys and girls of the Quitman County School System. And also since she wanted to share her knowledge of some undocumented history of the early life of Blacks in the Delta, she wrote a book entitled "Drifting Into Falcon."

Mrs. Davis is the mother of three daughters: Pamela, Jamesetta and Wanda, who is deceased. She has five grandchildren: Larry, Brandon, Darnell, Steve and Ashley; and four great grandchildren: Debrisha, Marian, Lauren and Laila.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Lillie V. Davis because she is definitely the epitome of an unsung hero.

ESSAY BY LAUREN GROVER

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight from across the political spectrum that sheds a light on the concerns of our younger constituents. Giving voice to their priorities will hopefully instill a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Lauren Grover attends Clear Springs High School in League City, Texas. The essay topic is: Select an important event that has occurred in the past year and explain how that event has changed/shaped our country.

In this past year there have been numerous significant events that have transpired and while many of them have shaped our country as a whole; I believe that there is one in particular that has changed our country by stating something that for a while has been suppressed. The Supreme Court case Obergefell vs. Hodges or as many people know it, the legalization of same sex marriage. While many people believe that it has caused the people to choose sides, I strongly believe that it has actually allowed people to come together in different ways and has slowly started to allow for more tolerance. Before this case, many people believed that implementing rules such as "don't ask, don't tell" would take care of awkward situations but by allowing the LGBT community to have legal marriage opportunities it will bring a new outlook for a new generation. This takes equality to the next level by allowing anyone and everyone to feel that they have the same rights as everyone else. As the younger generations become older the tolerance of the entire country will be greater. In the beginning the freedom was strictly meant for certain people which allowed for slavery and segregation which was later understood as being wrong to look down upon a person because of their skin color, then it was woman's rights which later turned into woman becoming an important role model and no longer living in a "man's world", and now the right to choose who will be able to love who comes into play and allowing ev-

everyone to have the same opportunities to be who they want to be. Everyone has the right to choose which path they want to travel without the fear that society will not approve of their decision. This country has had many ups and downs in the fight for freedom but the shape is becoming less strict and more accepting. Not only has the country become more tolerant but also open minded. The world is changing and the country is moving along with it. The amount of freedom given is in the hands of the people and it is their choice what happens with it.

PRESCIENT

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Prescient for receiving a Business Recognition Award from the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation.

Prescient offers a fully integrated design engineering and construction solution, including 3D virtual model system, welding robots, and CNC drilling machines allowing for industry-leading levels of material efficiency. Prescient has worked on the Colorado Christian University residence hall and the Hyatt House in Belmar.

The Business Recognition Award is given to companies that show growth in primary employment, sales and/or capital investment in the last year. Prescient is well-deserving of this award for their upcoming relocation and expansion of their manufacturing operations in Arvada which will bring 250 high-paying jobs to the county and \$8.9 million in capital investment to our community. The new facility is owned, and partially occupied by the Sorin Group, which has also decided to relocate their operations and 300-plus employees to Jefferson County.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Prescient for this well-deserved recognition by Jefferson County EDC. Thank you for your contributions to the Jefferson County economy and community.

TRIBUTE TO KOLBY JONES

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Kolby Jones for being named a 2016 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2016 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 640 business leaders and growing.

As the Director of Business Development at Ecosystem Services Exchange and the owner of a new restaurant, Kolby certainly does not find himself with much spare time. He has been tirelessly dedicated to improving water quality within the state of Iowa by promoting better practices that focus on drain tile line management. Kolby is also civically engaged in his community by chairing the Polo on the Green organization that has grown in its charitable donations each of the three years he has served. His work ethic and dedication to civic engagement is a true testament to his character and Iowa values.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Kolby in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Kolby on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2016 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

TWO-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE NIGERIAN GIRLS KIDNAPPING

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, today marks two years since the terrorist group Boko Haram abducted nearly 300 Nigerian school girls from their school in the middle of the night. Most of those girls have not been seen or heard from since.

Boko Haram has abducted, imprisoned, and violated countless women and girls in Nigeria and surrounding countries.

They have displaced more than 2 million people, including 1.4 million children, who have seen their homes destroyed, their families brutally killed, their lives torn apart.

In 2014, Boko Haram was responsible for nearly seven thousand deaths, making it deadlier than any other terrorist group, including ISIS.

But amid all the horrors in the world, the media and the global community have largely remained silent about Boko Haram's brutalities.

As a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security, I continue to advocate for increased attention to Boko Haram, knowing that the atrocities perpetrated by Boko Haram could very well cause further instability throughout the region and have significant implications for U.S. national security.

Earlier this year, I called for a committee hearing to explore the issues around Boko Haram. We have a moral responsibility to work toward the elimination of this terrorist group. Inaction is incompatible with our commitment to human rights.

Those who choose to ignore the ongoing atrocities committed by Boko Haram look at Africa and see instability and strife. Those of us here today look and see these kidnapped girls, and we think about what would happen to our own children if they were taken from us.

It is time for all of us to see these girls not as a burden of another nation, but as a responsibility of our own. It is time for us to help

secure justice on their behalf and their safe return to their families.

TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN LAWSON

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Stephen Lawson, Team Leader at the Modesto Vet Center, for his nine years of outstanding service to our nation's heroes and the Modesto community. Stephen has announced that he will be retiring on April 29, 2016.

In 1969, Stephen enlisted in the U.S. Navy and served as a Corpsman. After being honorably discharged in 1973 he found his home in the heart of the San Joaquin Valley, in Merced California.

After his service in the military, Stephen's first job was at the Merced College Veterans Office where he found a position working with veterans returning home and was in charge of the Outreach and Peer counseling. In this capacity, Stephen provided outstanding service to many veterans who were in need of his help and guidance.

In 1984, Stephen graduated from Fresno State University with a Master's Degree in Rehabilitation Psychology. He found a passion in helping his fellow veterans and furthered his career by working as a Rehabilitation Counselor at a large counseling firm.

Eventually, Stephen started Lawson Professional Counseling Corp. Under his leadership, the company grew to 50 employees and 10 offices throughout the Central Valley. On November 19, 2007, Stephen began at the Modesto Vet Center and was appointed Team Leader. Stephen always aimed to assure that veterans received the highest standard of care.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Stephen Lawson for his many years of service and outstanding contributions to the veteran community as well as our country.

TRIBUTE TO ARTHUR ROBERT SEIDLER

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to the remarkable Arthur "Art" Robert Seidler who passed away in California on Wednesday, March 30, 2016. Art was a pillar of the community in Corona, California, and he will be deeply missed.

As a child, Art moved from Chicago, Illinois, to Glen Avon in Riverside County, California. After attending Riverside Poly High School, Art enlisted in the Army Air Corps in March of 1942, where he would ultimately fly B25 Medium Range bomber planes. In a highlight of his time in military service, Art was given orders to fly a brand new B25 from San Francisco to Hawaii, where it would be outfitted for combat. Art immediately flew the new plane and buzzed the house of his girlfriend Patricia Smith, who later became his wife and mother to his three children Kurt, Trudy, and Robert.

Following his military service, Art went to college at the University of Southern California where he obtained an undergraduate degree in business and a law degree. After passing the California State Bar, Art worked for the Riverside District Attorney and later joined the Ganahl and Ganahl law firm in Corona. Eventually Art started his own law practice alongside his son, Kurt, where he practiced law for the next thirty-six years. As an active member of the Corona community, Art was a dedicated member of the Corona Elks Club on East Sixth.

The way in which Art lived his life should serve as a reminder that the power of an individual with drive, perseverance and a strong work-ethic can do great things. His dedication to his work, family, and community are a testament to a life lived well and a legacy that will continue. I was proud to call Art my friend and I will deeply miss him. I extend my condolences to Art's family and friends; although Art may be gone, the light and goodness he brought to the world remains and will never be forgotten.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TIM MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 141, had I been present, I would have voted Yes.

RECOGNIZING RECIPIENTS OF THE IOWA RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION'S FIRST QUARTER 2016 STARS OF HOSPITALITY PROGRAM

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Matthew Rumeliote, Pam Bartholomew, Cindy Papouchis and Donna Meacham with Northwestern Steakhouse, Mason City. These four outstanding individuals are recipients of the Iowa Restaurant Association's First Quarter 2016 Stars of Hospitality Program.

The Iowa Restaurant Association's Stars of Hospitality Program celebrates individuals who have made a career in the restaurant by working at a single establishment and/or for a specific company for more than 20 years. The Program recognizes the importance of these team members to their employer, while also celebrating the professionalism they display daily.

In a meeting in my Washington, D.C. office, I was told about the perseverance and work ethic of the recipients. The stories brought a smile to my face because wherever we go, in-state, out-of-state or abroad, Iowans are well-known for their hard work and pull yourself up by your bootstraps mentality.

I am also grateful to the numerous restaurants across our state and our nation that provide varied opportunities, good-paying jobs and upward mobility for millions of Americans.

The contribution these businesses make to our market and culture should be acknowledged by all and remembered by lawmakers when we craft policy that impacts the restaurant industry. Overly zealous regulation that harms hardworking business also diminishes opportunities for hardworking individuals, those like Matthew, Pam, Cindy and Donna.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for these individuals, businesses and the opportunity to recognize American success. In our nation, if you work hard, you can accomplish much. We need to make sure it stays that way.

REED GROUP

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Reed Group for receiving a Business Recognition Award from the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation.

The Business Recognition Award is given to companies that show growth in primary employment, sales and/or capital investment in the last year. Providing extended leave management services for public and private organizations, the company helps organizations reduce the cost, compliance risk and complexity of employee absence. Its products and services address FMLA, ADA, state and other leave laws, worker's compensation and short-term and long-term disability programs.

Currently, Reed Group employs 530 people nationwide including 442 people at its headquarters in Westminster. The ever-changing business environment means more employers are actively managing employee absence as a way to improve operations and drive better results. Because of this, Reed Group is planning to add an additional 150 employees over the next 3-5 years. During 2015, the company hired 77 employees, which included nurses, IT specialists and customer service representatives. In 2016, due to a major acquisition, the company will add another 200 employees making it the second largest extended-leave management services provider in the nation.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Reed Group for this well-deserved recognition by Jefferson County EDC. Thank you for your contributions to the Jefferson County economy and community.

ESSAY BY MARSHALL FOSTER

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight from across the political spectrum that sheds a light on the concerns of our younger constituents. Giving voice to their priorities will

hopefully instill a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Marshall Foster attends Dawson High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: Select an important event that has occurred in the past year and explain how that event has changed/shaped our country.

This past year, President Barack Obama signed a nuclear agreement with Iranian leaders and other world leaders that would lift economic sanctions off of Iran in return for Iran's compliance concerning nuclear activities. This deal was put into place under the extremely dangerous mindset that a bad deal is better than no deal. President Obama and his administration have basically written a large check to a corrupt Iranian government, a government that funds and harbors terrorists, in return for their compliance with the rules they are already supposed to be following.

This agreement severely weakens our great country and empowers Iran. We know that Iran is a radical Islamic state and yet this deal legitimizes Iran's nuclear program. We are now allowing Iran to continue to enrich uranium, after years of insisting they cease. The deal also allows Iran to keep over 6,000 centrifuges, something that will accelerate their capability to enrich the uranium. President Obama's promise that "if Iran cheats, the world will know it" is an empty one. Iran has proven time and time again that they have no problem violating agreements when it proves beneficial to them. Our inspections will most likely prove to be too little, too late to stop their illegal activities. In short, the deal provides only limited and unenforceable restraints on Iran's nuclear advancements while at the same time providing them with relief of economic sanctions.

The world is watching. This deal makes the United States of America, the country who should be viewed as the greatest power in the world, look weak. We have made a deal with a country led by a man who refers to us as "The Great Satan" and funds the terrorist groups that call for the destruction of our nation. Iran has continually shown that they do not want to establish peaceful relations with the United States while they are fighting their "Holy War" against the West. We are giving power to a country who is by most seen as our most unpredictable and biggest nuclear threat. Our president and his administration have jeopardized the safety of our own country, as well as the safety of our allies. However, when being optimistic, it is possible that this display of weakness shown by the current president will show the American people that we need a stronger and smarter Commander in Chief.

HONORING JERUSALEM OUTREACH CHILD & ADULT LEARNING CENTER

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Jerusalem Outreach Child and Adult Learning Center in Charleston, MS. It is locally referred to as JOCI (Jerusalem Outreach Center Incorporated).

JOCI was established as a nonprofit organization in the year 2000. JOCI was one of the partners in a county wide effort to provide service to citizens living in hard to reach and underserved communities in Tallahatchie County like Paynes and Glendora. JOCI's goal is to meet the educational and health and social welfare needs of both children and adults regardless of race. Their partner Glendora Economic and Community Development Corporation (GECDCo) focused on the development needs of the communities like housing, recreation, jobs, and more.

In order to achieve the above goals JOCI hosts health fairs and provides a long list of services. The services include, but are not limited to: personal counseling, referrals to outside resources, depending on the issue; social therapy for special needs clients; child care; after school care and services; educational classes; tutoring; and more. Since 2000, JOCI's record of achievement has attracted new partners to their effort: Mississippi State University Early Childhood Institute, Quality Stars, the Department of Human Services, and the Tallahatchie Early Learning Alliance (TELA).

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Jerusalem Outreach Child & Adult Learning Center in Charleston, MS for their work in those hard to reach communities in Tallahatchie County, MS.

TRIBUTE TO NOREEN OTTO

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Noreen Otto for being named a 2016 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2016 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 640 business leaders and growing.

As the Vice President for Government Relations at Hy-Vee, Noreen has been committed to helping stores across the Midwest be as successful as possible. Her drive to continuously learn more about her company, how it works, and how she can better serve it has led to her success. She is also a dedicated member of her community, as she serves on three separate nonprofit boards as well as recently being appointed to the Jasper County Board of Review. Her willingness to serve others and dedication to community involvement is a true testament to her Iowa values.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Noreen in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues

in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Noreen on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2016 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

CONGRATULATIONS ON THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

HON. CHARLES J. "CHUCK" FLEISCHMANN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, on April 10th, the United States and Taiwan celebrated the 37th anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA). This U.S. law, passed in 1979, codifies the enduring strength of the relationship between our two great peoples.

Taiwan is one of America's oldest and most dependable partners in Asia. The U.S.-Taiwan relationship is based on our shared values and our common interest in stability and prosperity in East Asia. Taiwan is a young democracy, but its people have built a prosperous and free society with strong institutions, worthy of emulation and envy.

I would also like to highlight that U.S.-Taiwan relations have been at its best since 1979, not only demonstrated at the government-to-government level, but also in grassroots and people-to-people connection. Just take our bilateral trade for example. Seven years ago this island of 23 million people was our 15th largest export partner. Now, Taiwan has grown to become our 9th largest overall trading partner and our 7th largest destination for agricultural exports. Also, Taiwan is the 5th largest export market for Asia in my home state of Tennessee. Moreover, Taiwan participated in the U.S. Visa Waiver Program in 2012. As a result, travel for business and pleasure from Taiwan to the United States jumped 35 percent in 2013 alone. With these robust and strong connections, I am not surprised that in the past three years there were 40 state legislative chambers that passed resolutions in support of our close relationship with Taiwan. I am proud that Tennessee was one of them and has the sister-state relationship with Taiwan.

As our focus on the Asia-Pacific increases, we will maintain our commitment to TRA and continue to support Taiwan's freedom, democracy, and economic prosperity.

IN HONOR OF THE WYOMING STATE SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Wyoming State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, which will hold its one hundred and first annual conference on May 20–22, 2016 in Thermopolis,

Wyoming. Nearly one hundred members will attend, including State Regent Susan Haines as well as the national organization's President General Lynn Forney Young. As part of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, the Wyoming State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution is a volunteer organization comprised of women who can prove lineal descent from a patriot of the American Revolution. The Wyoming State Society has eleven chapters, with some five hundred members statewide. Its mission of historic preservation, promotion of education, and encouragement of patriotic activities improves the communities in which we live. These dedicated women contribute their time and resources working with school groups and veterans all over the state. They also welcome new American citizens at naturalization ceremonies held in Wyoming.

Each chapter in the State Society has a unique connection to the local community and its history. For instance, in Thermopolis, where this year's conference will be held, the local chapter is named for Chief Washakie of the Shoshone Tribe. In 1896, Chief Washakie, along with Chief Sharp Nose of the Arapaho Tribe, sold land encompassing the local mineral hot springs to the United States government. He insisted a portion of the sale be used to create an area for public use, which resulted in the creation of Hot Springs State Park in 1897. Each year, the Washakie Chapter holds The Gift of the Waters Pageant to commemorate Chief Washakie's gift of the hot springs. It is my honor to acknowledge this and the many other contributions to society the women of the Daughters of the American Revolution have made throughout history, and continue to make today.

HONORING MEMBERS OF THE WINTERS MIDDLE SCHOOL ART CLASS

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, we rise to recognize and honor the members of the Winters Middle School Art Class for their contribution to the designation ceremony of the Berryessa Snow Mountain Monument by President Barack Obama on July 10, 2015.

This outstanding accomplishment was made possible the tireless work of countless advocates. Their commitment to engaging friends, colleagues, local residents, businesses, stakeholders across the country, and policymakers in a coordinated effort to achieve permanent protection was critical to the establishment of the Monument.

Now, the Berryessa Snow Mountain Monument may be counted among the hundreds of pristine parks across the country that represent America's most treasured public resources. The region's unique geological formations will play host for the world's scientists for years to come. Centuries-old archeological sites will draw curious historians and researchers as they piece together the stories of generations past. And avid bikers, hikers, campers, horsemen and women and sportsmen and women will be able to enjoy this landmark that is now forever open and accessible to outdoor

enthusiasts from Northern California and beyond.

The Berryessa Snow Mountain Monument serves as proof of the value of the Antiquities Act and the power of the Executive to protect these lands in the face of inaction by Congress. After extensive input from interested parties and substantial evidence of this region's value, the Obama Administration honored the support of stakeholders, and the gravity of conservation.

The legacy of public lands is one of the most important we can leave for future generations. The Berryessa Snow Mountain Monument is a critical piece of a preservation system that stretches from the Hawaiian Islands to the Maine Coast. We'd like to recognize the students of the Winters Middle School Art Class—Madison Duarte, Cinthia Garnica, Amaya Jimenez, Yesenia Rodriguez, Montana Maggenti, Victor Ayala, Leiayla Juarez, Jozlyn Rooney, Sofia Chavez, April Quezada, Jaime Mora, Alexis Biasi, Evan Barnett, Jaxson Davis, Crystal Cortez, Samatha Salgado and Asma Nuristani—for their part in the beautiful art work displayed at the designation ceremony.

EQUAL PAY DAY 2016

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, April 12, 2016, our nation marked Equal Pay Day, a day that symbolizes when, now four months into the new year, women's wages finally catch up to what their male counterparts earned during the previous year.

On June 10th, 1963, President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act, which established the principle of equal pay for equal work for women in the workforce.

Yet, sadly, more than 50 years later, women on average earn 79 cents for every dollar earned by men.

African-American women fare even worse, earning only 64 cents for every dollar earned by white, non-Hispanic men.

Today, families rely increasingly on women's wages to make ends meet, and with less take-home pay, women have less money to cover the everyday needs of their families.

In the spirit of Equal Pay Day 2016, I call upon Congressional Republicans to work with Democrats in getting the long-overdue Paycheck Fairness Act, H.R. 1619, enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, When Women Succeed, America Succeeds and our economy succeeds.

MAJORITY RULE ESSAY BY NANDAN MARWAHA

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I

have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight from across the political spectrum that sheds a light on the concerns of our younger constituents. Giving voice to their priorities will hopefully instill a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Nandan Marwaha attends Clements High School in Sugar Land, Texas. The essay topic is: Majority Rule.

The idea that public policy makers have to justify their actions to the general public is one that was around long before the United States of America. It seems that the best way for this justification to happen is a basic utilitarian ethic, an ends-based methodology. It states that the action that should follow is one that promotes the greatest good for the greatest number. In other words, if the majority of people benefit from, or agree with, an action it ought morally be the one that is taken. This ethic applies to the majority rule system in the United States federal government, as utilitarianism clearly serves as a basis for this system.

However, we must place side-constraints on this theory in order to help the minorities, as we cannot just dismiss the ideas of 49% of the population. As a policymaker, I would take into account the views of the minorities in order to prevent their systematic oppression. Moreover, the perspectives of the minorities bring a new viewpoint to the table, and allow for government officials to solve societal ills. Thus, if I was ever to be part of the political machine, I would accept the views of the majority alongside the views of the minorities as both have an important role and carry equal weights. I would serve as a trustee, combining the different views to form a more comprehensive plan that all people can agree with. I would also push for more collaboration between the minorities and majorities in order to make a compromise that reaches everyone's needs.

Not only does the idea of majority rule affect public policy changes, but also the governmental system itself. For example, in a presidential election, the candidate who produces the most amounts of votes gains all the electoral votes from that state, a "winner-take-all" system. This serves as proof that the majority rule system gives too much power to the 51%. Not only that, but in the House of Representatives we see that a majority is able to control nearly all the actions of the government. We cannot simply ignore the voices of the minorities; they still play a vital role in the government.

Though majority rule has its fair share of benefits, it also has an equitable amount of flaws. However, the government obligation is to serve and please as many of its constituents as it can, so majority rule serves as the best ideal for any governmental system.

TRIBUTE TO ZACH NUNN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Zach Nunn for being named a 2016 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify

a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2016 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 640 business leaders and growing.

As a state representative, cyber entrepreneur at SimSpace Corporation, and as a Major in the U.S. Air Force, Zach certainly finds himself with little spare time. He works tirelessly in the Iowa Legislature to promote the State of Iowa and increase economic opportunities both domestically and abroad. Zach is also dedicated to improving relationships among public and private entities so we are able to protect businesses and government from cyber threats. His dedication to the State of Iowa and our country are a true testament to his Iowa values.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Zach in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Zach on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2016 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

HONORING MR. HAROLD WARD, JR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable Unsung Hero, Mr. Harold Ward, Jr., a resident of Winstonville, Mississippi.

Harold Ward, Jr. was born and raised in the small town of Mound Bayou, Mississippi, where he graduated from John F. Kennedy Memorial High School in 1999. After graduating from high school, Harold attended Coahoma Community College in Clarksdale, Mississippi, and Mississippi Valley State University in Itta Bena, Mississippi. Harold is a member of Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church in Mound Bayou. He is the son of Judge Harold Ward Sr. and Patricia White-Ward; the youngest of four children: Ms. Chauncila M. Ward (deceased), Dr. Kendria Ward, and Attorney Yumekia Ward; the grandson of the late Napoleon White Sr. and Mrs. Earline J. Hill, Reverend Henry Ward and Mrs. Iola Ward.

Mr. Ward was born with sickle cell disease. At the age of 25, Harold's oldest sister, Chauncila, passed away from complications of sickle cell disease. Sickle Cell Disease is an inherited blood disorder that affects nearly 100,000 Americans. Sickle Cell Disease causes red blood cells to form into crescent shapes like sickles that cuts off the oxygen supply to the blood causing excruciating pain. Even though Mr. Ward suffers from this debilitating disease, he does not allow it to completely make him bedridden and on his good days he does volunteer work.

Always unselfish with his time and immensely involved with community service activities in the City of Mound Bayou and the town of Winstonville, Mississippi. Mr. Ward has been a constant inspiration to others.

In 2007, he began volunteering his services at Delta Health Center in Mound Bayou, Mississippi, where he assisted nurses with triage patients, filing documents, and read Christmas stories to patients' children. He also aided in the recruitment of patients to the facility by going door to door informing people of the services available at Delta Health Center. In 2014 Mr. Ward was lead sales representative with Humana and guided qualified individuals through the sign-up process for Obamacare.

Mr. Ward reorganized the town of Winstonville Volunteer Fire Department where he currently serves as Fire Chief. He encouraged people in the community between the ages of 21–35 to volunteer their services to the town by becoming a volunteer fire fighter.

On February 22, 2015 he received an award from Chi Mu Omega Chapter of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated, of Mound Bayou, Mississippi, in recognition for his outstanding contributions and dedicated services in the field of health.

Mr. Ward compassionately volunteers with the City of Mound Bayou, serving as assistant to Mayor Darryl Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this amazing Unsung Hero.

IN HONOR OF PEARLIE S. REED

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I pay tribute to an outstanding civic leader and public servant, Pearlle S. Reed. Mr. Reed passed away on Friday, April 8, 2016. A funeral service was held on Friday, April 15, 2016 11:00 a.m. at Old St. Paul Baptist Church in West Memphis, Arkansas.

Mr. Reed was born in Heth, Arkansas and attended the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, where he earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Animal Husbandry in 1970. He later earned a master's degree in Public Administration-Finance from American University in Washington, DC, in 1980.

Mr. Reed began his career with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Conservation Service while he was still a college student in 1968. In the years that followed, Mr. Reed rose steadily in the Soil Conservation Service from a soil conservationist, to deputy state conservationist, to State Conservationist for Maryland from 1985–1989 and State Conservationist for California from 1989–1993. Mr. Reed then served as Associate Chief after the Soil Conservation Service was renamed the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). In this capacity, he spearheaded the most comprehensive reorganization of the agency in its 60-year history. He also initiated the American Indian outreach effort for NRCS to work directly with tribes and provided leadership in the development and implementation of the Conservation Title of the 1996 Farm Bill.

In 1997, Mr. Reed served as Acting Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Administration

before he was promoted to Chief of NRCS in 1998, a position he held until 2002 when he was named Regional Conservationist for the Western United States.

In 1996, then-Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman appointed Mr. Reed to lead the Secretary's Civil Rights Action Team to develop recommendations to advance civil rights within USDA. The Team made 92 recommendations and President Bill Clinton issued an order that all recommendations be implemented. As Mr. Reed stated, "the work of the Civil Rights Action Team is recognized as having set direction for civil rights policy at USDA to ensure that every employee treats every customer and co-worker fairly and equitably, with dignity and respect."

Although Mr. Reed retired from USDA in 2003, his strong and effective leadership was widely noted, and he was nominated by President Barack Obama to serve as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in May 2009. Mr. Reed also served as a leader of several USDA-wide initiatives, such as the chair of the USDA/1990 Task Force, chair of the USDA Agricultural Air Quality Task Force, and chair of the USDA National Food and Agriculture Council. His service included international conservation experience and his contributions in South Africa, Australia, and the International Soil Conservation Organization demonstrate the breadth of his influence.

For nearly four decades, Pearlle Reed was a familiar face at USDA and a driving force for progress within the Department. He acted as a voice for disadvantaged and minority farmers and worked tirelessly to advocate for the conservation of our nation's precious resources. Over the course of his career, Mr. Reed received numerous awards and commendations, including the Distinguished Presidential Rank Award for strength, integrity, industry, and a relentless commitment to public service; the George Washington Carver Public Service Hall of Fame Award; and the USDA Secretary's Honor Award for equal opportunity and civil rights; among others.

On a personal note, I had the privilege of working closely with Pearlle during my time on the House Agriculture Committee and through my ongoing service on the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. I have truly been blessed by his friendship, counsel and inspiration throughout the years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in saluting Pearlle S. Reed for his outstanding public service and his influence on progress at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. We extend our deepest condolences to Mr. Reed's family and friends during this difficult time and we pray they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

IN APPRECIATION OF THE
SERVICE OF STEPHANIE BAEZ

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Stephanie Baez for her dedicated service to the House of Representatives. Over the

past six years, she worked for several Members representing her home state of New York and most recently the House Judiciary Committee, where she has served as the Communications Director for the Democratic staff.

A 2008 graduate of Stony Brook University, Stephanie majored in political science with a concentration in journalism. She began her career on Capitol Hill in 2010 as a staff assistant for Congressman Anthony Weiner of New York, where she was promoted to press assistant and legislative correspondent. She then served as a press assistant and legislative correspondent for the office of Congressman CHARLES B. RANGEL, and later served as the communications director for Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES. In 2014, she was hired as the communications director for the House Judiciary Committee Democratic staff.

As the spokesperson for the Committee, Stephanie worked tirelessly to disseminate the messages of the Democratic Members, create and maintain relationships with the press, manage the Committee social media accounts, and overhaul the Democratic website. She organized many high profile press briefings and coordinated with other Committees and their Members to ensure the press received timely and accurate information. Stephanie excelled at all of these tasks. She earned a well-deserved reputation for being dependable, and her expertise and energy were appreciated by staff and Members alike.

We thank Stephanie for her many outstanding contributions to the House Judiciary Committee and the U.S. House of Representatives, and wish her well as she returns to New York to work for the New York Economic Development Corporation. She will surely be missed.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS ANNUAL "STAMP OUT HUNGER" FOOD DRIVE

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the National Association of Letter Carriers (NALC) on their continued efforts to eliminate hunger in the United States by creating and sponsoring the "Stamp Out Hunger" Annual Food Drive, the largest one-day food drive in the country.

On the second Saturday of May, letter carriers across the United States collect food donations on their postal routes to deliver to community food banks, shelters, and pantries. Each year, over 175,000 letter carriers in more than 10,000 cities and towns participate in Stamp Out Hunger, which collected 71 million pounds of food nationwide in the last year.

Stamp Out Hunger began as a pilot program in just ten cities. But soon it became clear that the food drive was a resounding success, and it was expanded nationwide. The program asks postal patrons to place a box or bag of food next to their mailboxes. The food is then picked up, sorted at postal stations and then delivered to local food banks by letter carriers.

In my state of California, The California State Association of Letter Carriers is among the top contributors in the nation to the food

drive, collecting over 6 million pounds of food in 2015 alone. It is my hope that during the month of May, more Americans will consider becoming involved in the NALC Food Drive to help those members of our communities who face hunger every day.

I express my strong appreciation for America's Letter Carriers, and their tradition of community service and commitment to improving the lives of needy citizens. I also wish to acknowledge the NALC's organizing partners—the United States Postal Service, United Food and Commercial Workers International, National Rural Letter Carriers Association, United Way Worldwide, AFL CIO, Valpak, and Valassis for their assistance and support for the Letter Carriers Food Drive.

Finally, I urge each American to leave a can of food by their mailbox on the second Saturday in May. Together, we can Stamp Out Hunger and make a difference in the lives of millions of Americans.

IN HONOR OF MIKE WESTCOTT, YAVAPAI COUNTY'S TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents, Mike Westcott, of Verde Valley, Arizona.

Mike Westcott recently received the teacher of the year award for outstanding work as a teacher at Mingus Union High School. Westcott has excelled in teaching sciences, specifically Chemistry, at Mingus Union High for 30 years. Mr. Westcott has contributed greatly to the advancement of his local learning community.

Mike Westcott's dedication to the Mingus Union community extends even further back than his teaching career. He is a third-generation native of Verde Valley where he himself attended and graduated from Mingus Union High School. He continued his studies at Yavapai College and then earned a Bachelor's of Science degree from Northern Arizona University. In the following years he received a MAT degree in Physical Science and a M.Ed. degree in Educational Leadership from NAU as well. After his own academics successes, Westcott directed his energy to better the students of Mingus Union High School. He has taught a number of various science classes but favors chemistry. He has also taught Advanced Placement chemistry for more than 15 years. Mr. Westcott has further contributed to the school and community as a teacher on administrative assignment and as an instructional coach.

Mr. Westcott is a prime example of a great educator, and the positive influence that he has on his students will resonate for years to come.

HONORING OFFICER BRIAN STROCKBINE

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Brian Strockbine, of the Third Congressional District, who is an 11-year veteran of the Evesham Township Police Department, and in his past three work shifts, has miraculously saved the lives of three civilians.

On March 8, 2016, and March 17, 2016 Officer Strockbine responded to two separate instances in which a female was reported unresponsive. In both incidents, Officer Strockbine was first on the scene and immediately began CPR on the victims, eventually able to stabilize and save their lives.

Finally, on March 12, 2016, Officer Strockbine responded to a car accident with injuries. Officer Strockbine was first on the scene and noticed that the interior of the vehicle was filled with smoke and about to catch fire. Officer Strockbine broke the passenger side window and carried the victim to safety.

In a one-week period, Officer Strockbine saved three lives, and prevented the families of these individuals from an immense level of suffering and grief. He is a true public servant, who continually puts his life on the line to protect and serve his community.

Mr. Speaker, the people of New Jersey's Third Congressional District are tremendously honored to have Officer Brian Strockbine as a member of their community, who has dedicated his career to putting the safety of others before himself, and has saved many civilian lives in the process. I am honored to recognize him for his service and to commend him for all that he has done for his community, before the United States House of Representatives.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HENRY FORD COLLEGE FEDERATION OF TEACHERS AFT LOCAL 1650

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Henry Ford College Federation of Teachers AFT Local 1650. The members of Henry Ford AFT have been dedicated to the Dearborn community and Southeast Michigan since their inception, demonstrating the power of education in uplifting a community.

Henry Ford Community College was founded in 1938 as a public two year college in Dearborn, Michigan. Henry Ford College, as it is called today, has been a gateway to higher education for thousands of students, offering high quality programming at an affordable tuition rate. Throughout the years, Henry Ford College has been able to deliver top level education because of their excellent faculty and staff.

In 1966, full time teaching faculty, counselors, and librarians at Henry Ford College chartered the AFT Local 1650 to ensure that

the staff at the college had a voice in the future of the college. Their devotion to fair pay and workplace rules, security, academic freedom, and quality have created a tremendous benefit for both the faculty and the students, and have contributed to the strength of Henry Ford College. In their first year, AFT Local 1650 became the first college faculty bargaining unit in the country to go on strike; this action instilled a level of solidarity among staff members that exists even today. In 2013, the faculty bargaining unit negotiated a new community college contract with the Henry Ford College board of trustees. This agreement is widely interpreted as a model community college contract agreement in the country and has set the precedent for other educators throughout the country to pattern their agreements on. Through their efforts, AFT Local 1650 has preserved a tradition of shared governance for the common good and has ensured that teachers, faculty, and students will always have their voices heard by the College administration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Henry Ford Community College Federation of Teachers AFT Local 1650 and wish them many more years of success.

HONORING THE LIFE AND CONGRESSIONAL LEGACY OF MINNESOTA'S MARTIN OLAV SABO

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 2016 former Minnesota Congressman Martin Olav Sabo passed away. For twenty-eight years Rep. Sabo represented Minneapolis, Minnesota and the surrounding suburban communities in the U.S. House. He was a giant of a legislator, an exceptional public servant, and a man I respected tremendously.

It was my profound honor to serve with Martin during the final six years of his career. He was liberal, smart, and his values reflected the very best of Minnesota's traditions and heritage. In Congress, Martin was reserved, but when he spoke the room went silent because everyone knew something worth hearing was about to be said. Martin was truly an experienced and astute legislator.

In 1960 Martin Sabo was first elected to the Minnesota House of Representatives at the age of 22. Over his eighteen year career as a state legislator he served three years as minority leader and six years as the Speaker of the House. He was elected to Congress in 1978 where he immediately was appointed a member of the House Appropriations Committee—an impressive and very significant status.

In the early 1990s Rep. Sabo served as the House Budget Committee Chairman and is credited with guiding the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1973 through the House. This historic legislation set the country on a course that resulted in a federal budget surplus.

Over his career Martin Sabo's work on behalf of Minnesota transformed our state and helped create the economic success experienced by the Twin Cities today. After Martin's

delivered funding the Hiawatha light rail transit line in Minneapolis, I had the privilege of working with Martin to secure the Central Corridor light rail transit line that has now connected downtown St. Paul and downtown Minneapolis. This infrastructure investment is transforming the Twin Cities and it all started with Martin Sabo's sage guidance and his ability to take ideas and turn them into tangible projects.

Martin was well known for being a quiet Norwegian. He loved baseball and especially the Minnesota Twins. He was also one of the kindest of souls.

When Martin left Congress at the end of 2006 we lost an effective and wise public servant. Now, Minnesota has lost the last of a generation of citizen legislators who was always respectful, civil, and true to his values. In other words, we've lost a good man.

My deepest sympathies go out to Sylvia Sabo, Martin's wife of fifty-two years, along with their daughters Karin and Julie, and their many grandchildren.

SKYWRITER MD

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Skywriter MD for receiving the Innovative Technology Award from the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation.

The Innovative Technology Award is given to a company that is on the forefront of new and advanced technologies including the industries of aerospace, aviation, bioscience, energy, outdoor recreation and apparel, among others. As a startup, Skywriter specializes in electronic medical record (EMR) technology and provides a much-needed service for providers that have lost EMR documentation. The company developed a software tool that offers real-time communication and connectivity with virtual scribes, who serve as an extension of a physician's arm throughout the patient visit. Skywriter helps providers navigate the EMR, enter data and execute other tasks as directed. The user interface supports direct and indirect interaction throughout the patient visit, while non-intrusive presence of Skywriters enables a more personable patient-physician encounter.

Skywriter recently expanded its operations by adding a second location in Westminster's Westmoor Technology Park. The company leased 16,000 square feet and brought 120 jobs to Jefferson County. The company predicts to grow to 600 employees in the next three years.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Skywriter for this well-deserved recognition by Jefferson County EDC. Thank you for your contributions to the Jefferson County economy and community.

HONORING NORTH PANOLA HIGH SCHOOL

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable school, North Panola High School of Sardis, Mississippi and the great leadership it is under.

North Panola High School is a rural high school situated on the eastern edge of the Mississippi delta. For many years the high school has been a part of a school district that had been plagued by low test scores, violence and a negative school culture. The school district had been taken over by the state several times due to year after year of low test scores.

In July of 2011, Robert King, Conservator of the North Panola School District, hired Jamone Edwards as the principal of North Panola High School. Jamone Edwards, a graduate of Mississippi State University and The University of Mississippi, was the youngest principal the school had ever witnessed. He brought innovative ideas and worked tirelessly to increase teacher morale and create a positive school culture. Under his leadership and the staff's support, the school has made significant gains in the accountability model in which schools are rated. Prior to the new leadership, for many years the school was considered low performing and on academic watch. During his tenure, the school rose to Successful, which is equivalent to a C school. In the 2013–14 school year, Mr. Edwards led the school to its first ever High Performing Status, which is equivalent to a B school. This is a remarkable achievement as the school had never experienced such success and recognition.

Additionally, since 2010, the school has many successes to celebrate. The school's graduation rate was at an all-time low of 49 percent in 2010. Since that time, the graduation rate has risen to 73 percent for the 2013–14 academic school year. Currently, the high school is projected to have a graduation rate of 85 percent for the 2014–15 accountability rating. In addition, Algebra I and U.S. History subject area test scores have surpassed the state's average, and English II and Biology I state test scores are slightly trailing the state's average.

North Panola High School has also made significant improvement in preparing students for college and acquiring scholarships. In 2010, the mean ACT score was 14.8. Since that time, several students of North Panola High School have scored 20 or better on the ACT. In 2010, the high school graduating seniors had generated \$150,000 in scholarship monies. In 2014, the high school graduating class of approximately 80 students received in excess more than \$2 Million in scholarship monies creating more opportunities for our children to succeed in college and careers after high school.

In March 2015, North Panola High School received an award from the State Superintendent of Education, Dr. Carey M. Wright and the Mississippi Department of Education for closing the achievement gap between black and white students in the area of English/Language Arts and Mathematics. North Panola was one of the only predominantly minority high schools to be recognized

with the Distinguished School Award. As a result, North Panola High School received \$23,750.05 to further enhance the students' overall educational experience.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing North Panola High School for its dedication to serving our great state of Mississippi and country.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN RATHJEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Susan Rathjen for being named a 2016 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2016 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 640 business leaders and growing.

As the Vice President and Private Banker at Bankers Trust, Susan has worked tirelessly to keep her company ahead of the curve on technological advances, especially those that can provide a smoother customer experience. She has also been dedicated to finding the best and brightest employees to help move the company forward. Susan is also passionately involved in advocating for those who suffer from mental illness and serves on the board of Goodwill Industries of Central Iowa. Her dedication to her work as well as to her community is a true testament to Susan's Iowa values.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Susan in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Susan on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2016 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

THE RISE OF ISIS ESSAY BY MELISSA LEE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight

from across the political spectrum that sheds a light on the concerns of our younger constituents. Giving voice to their priorities will hopefully instill a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Melissa Lee is a student from Sugar Land, Texas. The essay topic is: The rise of ISIS.

The United States has always been wary of the Middle East. With an almost decade-long occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan in addition to sanctions on Iran, America has attempted to delicately balance prevention of future attacks as well as peaceful relations with other world leaders. The U.S. has experienced unstable footing in this particular area due to untimely action and a lack of understanding of Middle Eastern culture. A series of terrorist attacks in Paris last year became a new spark to a longstanding debate of how to protect the nation, establish justice, and promote healthy ties with other countries. The attacks caused the U.S. to rethink its position on issues such as immigration and foreign policy. Though the bombings were tragic and a forever reminder of the darkness of human nature, they ignited a healthy dialogue about the future of America.

On November 13, 2015, three teams of radical men purportedly aligned with ISIS launched six attacks in and around Paris. One hundred thirty people were killed and many more injured. As the world watched the bloody scene unravel, many questioned the effectiveness of America's foreign policy. Should the U.S. crack down on the Islamic State and increase support for rebels fighting this extremist group? Or should it avoid interfering with the Middle East so as not to arouse anger or hatred towards America? Foreign policy assurances intended to assuage these fears proved empty as they turned out to be mere words than action. However, nobody raised an uproar; the Middle East seemed too far away and the carnage of terrorist attacks was too distant from the comforts of American life. But the U.S. received its wake-up call on December 2, 2015. A radicalized health department employee accompanied by his wife opened fire at a holiday party in San Bernardino, killing 14 and seriously injuring 22 people. The attackers had been inspired by foreign terrorist groups and had committed to jihadism. Suddenly, Americans realized the growing threat of extremists in the Middle East and the extent of their influence on Muslims around the world.

The Paris attacks followed by those in San Bernardino made it clear to a growing number of people that the danger of radical jihadists is not a distant problem. Many still want to turn their heads away from the tangled web of terrorism, corruption, ineffective peace talks, and false promises encountered overseas. But as Americans have observed acts of terrorism grow closer and closer to home, they are confronted with the emerging reality that, unless the U.S. takes action promptly, these threats will travel to its shores and mature into a monster of evil, killing the innocent and having no mercy upon those who do not hold the same beliefs as the terrorists.

DC GRAY'S BASEBALL TEAM

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating the DC Gray's baseball team for being accepted to run Major League Baseball's (MLB) Reviving Baseball in the Inner City (RBI) Washington, D.C. program. The new initiative, "DC Grays RBI," will be a free middle school summer baseball and softball program for kids living in underserved communities in the District of Columbia.

The DC Grays is a talented collegiate summer baseball team that, in addition to competing in the Cal Ripken Collegiate Baseball League, strives to engage inner-city youth and their families with baseball. Their mission is to be "ambassadors for baseball" in the District by running summer baseball camps and clinics for D.C. youth.

The DC Grays' partnership with MLB will further help its mission of providing disadvantaged youth an opportunity to learn and enjoy the game of baseball. The programs help motivate young players to stay in school and pursue secondary education. MLB's RBI program helps teach youth not only the importance of success on the field but also in the classroom and the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to join me in commending the DC Grays for the important work it has done and continues to do in the community. We wish it luck in continuing to inspire and engage disadvantaged youth.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 142, between a pair of procedural votes on the rule for H.R. 2666, I left the floor of the House to meet with a group of constituents from back home. Accordingly, after our visit I went back to the floor as quickly as I could, but when I returned time had expired.

Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

37TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT (TRA)

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a very important day in U.S.-Taiwan relations. April 10th marked the 37th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA). This important statute has been critical in defining the diplomatic, economic, and strategic relationship we have enjoyed with Taiwan over the last four decades. In 2015, Taiwan became the United States' ninth largest trading partner. The TRA has strengthened our relationship and helped to encourage a particularly strong economic partnership.

On March 30, 2016, Taiwan President Ma gave a speech at the American Chamber of Commerce in Taipei (AmCham) Hsieh Nian Fan celebration. In his speech, President Ma pointed out that, in the U.S.-based *Global Finance* magazine's ratings of the world's richest countries from November of last year, Taiwan ranked 19th out of 185 countries worldwide. That put Taiwan right behind Germany, and far ahead of countries like France, Great Britain, Japan, and South Korea. And in the 2015 global competitiveness ratings published by the Institute of Management Development (IMD), based in Lausanne, Switzerland, Taiwan ranked 11th in the world, and third in the Asia-Pacific Region. Taiwan has created a thriving and innovative economy that most countries envy.

The growth of Taiwan is a living, breathing example that trade benefits humanity—and not just economically. President Ma highlighted the East China Sea Peace Initiative, which aimed to address sovereignty disputes in the region in 2012. Subsequently, in 2013, Taiwan signed a fisheries agreement with Japan. Both nations maintained their sovereignty while enhancing fishing rights, which resulted in a triple yield of catches. And that's good for a world in which the demand for fish keeps rising.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to a continuing successful cooperation between the United States and Taiwan. I am also confident that if we continue to enhance our economic relationship, this dynamic partnership that we've built together will not only last but also thrive in the future, working alongside one another to, as President Ma quipped, realize the day in which "The only one party which is not happy is the fish."

HONORING MEMBERS OF THE WINTERS MIDDLE SCHOOL BAND AND CHOIR

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, we rise to recognize and honor the members of the Winters Middle School Band and Choir for their contribution to the designation ceremony of the Berryessa Snow Mountain Monument by President Barack Obama on July 10, 2015.

This outstanding accomplishment was made possible by the tireless work of countless advocates. Their commitment to engaging friends, colleagues, local residents, businesses, stakeholders across the country, and policymakers in a coordinated effort to achieve permanent protection was critical to the establishment of the Monument.

Now, the Berryessa Snow Mountain Monument may be counted among the hundreds of pristine parks across the country that represent America's most treasured public resources. The region's unique geological formations will play host for the world's scientists for years to come. Centuries-old archeological sites will draw curious historians and researchers as they piece together the stories of generations past. And avid bikers, hikers, campers, horsemen and women and sportsmen and women will be able to enjoy this landmark that is now forever open and accessible to outdoor

enthusiasts from Northern California and beyond.

The Berryessa Snow Mountain Monument serves as proof of the value of the Antiquities Act and the power of the Executive to protect these lands in the face of inaction by Congress. After extensive input from interested parties and substantial evidence of this region's value, the Obama Administration honored the support of stakeholders, and the gravity of conservation.

The legacy of public lands is one of the most important we can leave for future generations. The Berryessa Snow Mountain Monument is a critical piece of a preservation system that stretches from the Hawaiian Islands to the Maine Coast. We'd like to recognize the students of the Winters Middle School Band and—Jose Montes, Silverio Magallanes, David Rivas, Katie Johnson, Melina Mora, Jasmine Moore, Kamila Mora, Melesio Perez, Arthur Cueva, Rylie Schroeder, Easton Rivera, Paige Davis, Karina Echeverria, Joseph Aguiar, Emmett Edman, Braydon Winslow, Erika Contreas, Josef Iten, Victoria Banuelos, Fatima Guzman, Jacqueline Mendoza, Veronica Soria, Jason Lichwa, Alejandra Junez, Emily Aguiar, Maximiliano Reyes Barajas, Haley Compton, David Morris, Elle Palmer, Garrett Matheson, Kevin Garcia, Christian Sponsler, Alan Chavez, Molly Moore, Donovan Melendez, Lauren Gomez, Katie Medina, Mallory Layne, Ethan Berg, Emily Hoag, Valeria Ceja, Trinity Sponsler, Juan Blano, Ulises De La Cruz, Rose Kakutani, Stephanie Angel Lopez, Alex Herrera, Celeste Garcia, Victor Melediez, Lorenzo Arce, Jose Figueroa, Marcos del Toro, Lillian Wirth, Katie Pelletier, Kaylee Smith, Sierra Berry and Haley Archibeque—for their role in the Winters Middle School Band and Choir and their outstanding performance at the designation ceremony.

ROBERT GEHLER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Commerce City Attorney Robert Gehler for his decades of service to the City of Commerce City, Colorado. For over forty years Mr. Gehler has been active within the City, including helping to draft the city charter.

Originally from South Dakota, Mr. Gehler came to Colorado as a member of the Judge Advocate General (JAG) Corps at Rocky Mountain Arsenal in 1964. In 1965, ready to leave the Army, Mr. Gehler passed the Colorado Bar and joined the firm of Berger and Rothstein, whose office was just outside the west gate of the arsenal. He served as Assistant County Attorney for Adams County from 1965 to 1968. In January of 1968, he was sworn in as City Attorney at the request of then-Mayor Eli Koff. In 1970, residents voted overwhelmingly to become a home rule city, instead of a statutory city, and the process of adopting a city charter began. The charter, which guides how local government functions, was approved on its first vote but has only been amended five times since its adoption—one of the City's most memorable legal achievements.

I extend my deepest thanks to Robert Gehler for his service to the community. Thank you for your continuous dedication to serving the constituents of Commerce City, Colorado.

HONORING MASTER OF ARMS 1ST CLASS CARL S. RANDOLPH ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE NAVY

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a constituent of mine, Master of Arms 1st Class Carl S. Randolph. He will be retiring from the Navy on May 1, 2016 after 22 years of dedicated service to our nation.

On July 10, 1995 Mr. Randolph joined the U.S. Navy and reported to Recruit Training Command in Great Lakes, Illinois. After graduating from recruit training he attended Ships Serviceman Class A School where upon graduation, MA1 Randolph was assigned to the USS *Russell* DDG 59 in Pearl Harbor, HI. In 1996 and 1998, Randolph was deployed to the Northern Arabian Gulf in support of Operation Northern Watch. During his time assigned to the USS *Russell*, Petty Officer Randolph received numerous awards which included: a Maritime Unit Commendation, a Navy Unit Commendation, and a Meritorious Service Medal.

On March 20, 2000, MA1 Randolph reported to NTTC Pensacola, FL for Aviation Machinist Mate Class A School. After graduation, MA1 Randolph received orders and was then assigned to VF-211 at NAS Oceana in Virginia Beach, VA. MA1 Randolph was assigned to the USS *Stennis* CVN 76 and was deployed to the Northern Arabian Gulf in support of Operation Northern Watch. In August 10, 2001, MA1 Randolph was honorably discharged from active service duty to attend college. On December 18, 2004, MA1 Randolph graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree, in Criminal Justice and a minor concentration in Sociology, from Southern Illinois University Edwardsville. MA1 Randolph began his employment as a Federal Police Officer for the Department of Veterans Affairs in St. Louis, Missouri, after graduation from college.

MA1 Randolph was voluntarily mobilized to Bagram Afghanistan for a Detainee Operation mission in support of Operation Enduring Freedom on October 15, 2007. During this deployment, MA1 Randolph earned his Aviation Warfare Specialist Pin from VAQ 134. MA1 Randolph had numerous responsibilities during his deployment including: cell guard, escort guard, segregation cell guard, and main floor NCO.

MA1 Randolph was assigned to COMNAVFORKOREA Det D on February 7, 2012. Then on November 6, 2014, MA1 Randolph was assigned to NSWDG in Virginia Beach, VA. From there he was deployed to support AFRICOM and returned back to COMNAVFORKOREA Det D in November of 2015. Additionally, MA1 Randolph has completed numerous Navy schools: Small Arms Marksmanship Instructor, Security Reaction Force Advanced, Non-Lethal Weapons Instructor, Anti-Terrorism Training Supervisor,

Reserve Career Information, Beamhit Instructor, and Security Reaction Force Basic.

Since September of 2009, MA1 Randolph has been employed as an Inspector for the Department of Homeland Security's Federal Protective Service. With this employment, MA1 Randolph oversees the law enforcement of all federal buildings in the states of Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa. The primary assignment location for MA1 Randolph is the St. Louis, MO area.

There are numerous professional schools that MA1 Randolph has graduated from; including: Department of Veterans Affairs Police Academy, Federal Protective Service Advance Individual Training Program, Department of Homeland Security Active Shooter Threat Instructor Training Program, Federal Protective Service Contract Officer Technical Representative, and the Federal Protective Service Electronic Control Device Instructor training.

MA1 Randolph has received many personnel awards including: Letter of Commendation from Rear Admiral G. R. Jones Commander of Amphibious Forces U.S. Seventh Fleet, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Navy Meritorious Service Medal, Navy Unit Commendation Award Ribbon, Afghanistan Service Medal, Enlisted Aviation Warfare Specialist Pin, and the Joint Service Commendation Medal.

With this retirement, MA1 Randolph can now spend more time with his family which includes: his wife Terri, 11-year-old son William, and 5-year-old daughter Katherine.

I ask you to join me in recognizing MA1 Randolph on his retirement after 22 years of commitment to his country, community, and state.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. ANNETTE G.
KRAMER

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, Annette Kramer, formerly of Detroit, and the youngest of eight children, was a remarkable, courageous woman who spent most of her life in the service of others, yet she never sought recognition or spoke of her deeds or accomplishments. A Marine wife and mother for more than 35 years, Annette lived a life of quiet sacrifices and countless hardships yet her generosity and selflessness knew no bounds as evidenced so many times throughout her life. She was extremely proud to be a part of the Marine Corps family, stoically supporting her daughter and husband through numerous deployments into harm's way. A woman of integrity, honor and fierce loyalty, Annette chose not to ignore the needs of those around her and was always there to lend a helping hand. For more than two decades, Annette served as a mentor to her friends and other military wives by helping them navigate through a wide array of local and military cultures, address family requirements, and provide help to those in need of counseling and support. Annette supported numerous combat Wounded Warriors and their families during their recovery phases at both Walter Reed and Bethesda Military Medical Centers and spent countless hours providing support and assistance to the

wives and families of fallen Marines. She continually gave a helping hand to Veterans of all services and found time to volunteer at her local ASPCA helping animals in need. Annette was a life member of the VFW Ladies Auxiliary, an Honor Flight volunteer, and was active and respected throughout her local community.

In the aftermath of 9/11, Annette spent long hours working at the Pentagon crash site as a volunteer member of the Pentagon Search and Recovery Task Force night shift, after working her regular day job. Receiving, organizing and distributing necessary supplies and equipment to task force personnel, Annette ensured that everyone had what they needed to complete their arduous tasks.

In 2003, during the early days of the Iraq war, there were equipment shortfalls for our warriors going into combat. Tirelessly ambitious, Annette organized several fund raising drives in order to send hundreds of much needed hydration systems to forward deployed Marines in Iraq. This effort was well received and had a very positive impact on combat forces conducting operations throughout Iraq. Over the years, she frequently helped organize and participate in drives supporting our deployed military personnel in Afghanistan and Iraq with equipment, care packages and other services to enhance capability, morale and let the brave men and women fighting for our freedom know that their sacrifices did not go unnoticed.

Every December for more than a decade, Annette helped with the laying of wreaths at Arlington National Cemetery. A proud American, upon returning home from Arlington, she would be filled with emotion having spent the day on hallowed ground in the company of so many fallen heroes.

A docent at the National Museum of the Marine Corps, Annette was adored by the staff and visitors alike, resulting in the museum generously installing a permanent name plate in her memory in their rotunda.

Annette was highly regarded at all levels, from homeless Veterans to senior leaders, because she truly cared about those who served and her community. Although Annette left this world prematurely, her memory will endure in the many hearts of those who were fortunate to have known her. Annette was interred in Arlington National Cemetery on October 26, 2015. More than 250 of those whose lives she touched attended her memorial service and interment ceremony, from military professionals representing all the armed services, to civilians from all walks of life. They traveled from throughout the U.S. as well as overseas bases to honor her.

Annette Kramer was a shining star who gave so much to her family, those who served and this great nation. Her family, friends and the military community will miss her dearly and honor her as a valiant American.

IN RECOGNITION OF LORI
WRIGHT'S RETIREMENT

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Lori Wright, who is retiring after 20

years of dedicated public service to the City of Highland Village, Texas. The community has benefited immeasurably from her unflagging encouragement, unfailing commitment to excellence, and from her attentive care to the city's council, staff, residents and businesses.

On January 3, 1995, Lori Wright began her career as a part time receptionist for the City of Highland Village. Her infectious personality and hard work boosted her through the ranks to administrative clerk by November of 1995. One year later, she advanced, yet again, to deputy city secretary. On March 1, 1999, she attained the position of executive assistant. She has capably provided support and continuity to three city managers during her career.

Mrs. Wright has fostered effective and consistent communication amongst the staff and beneficial dialogue between the city's administration and residents. Under her conscientious charge and in concert with her colleague Laurie Mullens, the Highland Village Business Association has grown into a vibrant organization to promote the city's business community. She has been instrumental in making the city's annual "Salute Our Veterans" luncheon a treasured event to honor local veterans. Each year, Mrs. Wright visits assisted living communities in the area to reach as many veterans as possible and encourage their attendance. She ensures that the luncheon operates smoothly and that every veteran present is greeted personally and treated with distinction. Mrs. Wright has worked closely with my district office to facilitate the public announcement and recognition of the 26th Congressional Veteran Commendation recipients.

In addition to her many administrative duties, Mrs. Wright has also played an important role in the development of the Honor Our Veterans Monument, working with city staff and council in the development and construction of the monument, serving as the city's liaison to the Veterans Committee to determine the policies for review and placement of veterans names and developed the presentation ceremony.

My best wishes to Mrs. Wright upon her well-earned retirement; her positive influence, her excellent work and tireless devotion to the community will be greatly missed. During her two decades as a public servant, Lori Wright was an able ambassador for the city and effectively helped the city government operate seamlessly for its residents. It is my privilege to honor such an outstanding citizen in the U.S. House of Representatives.

PROFESSOR DON T. NAKANISHI

HON. JUDY CHU
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 14, 2016

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Don T. Nakanishi, a renowned professor and pioneer of Asian American Studies, who passed away on Monday, March 21, 2016.

Dr. Nakanishi's vision and contributions to the UCLA Asian American Studies Center, the most renowned research and teaching institute of its kind in our nation, forever changed the national dialogue surrounding Asian Americans in politics and academia. His legacy will

live on long past his 35 year tenure at UCLA through this Center and the community of students and mentees he guided.

Dr. Nakanishi was no stranger to injustice. His mother, father, and elder brother were interned during World War II as a part of the policy against Japanese Americans. While he was born after the war, Dr. Nakanishi was raised in the multi-ethnic neighborhood of East Los Angeles, California and attended Theodore Roosevelt High School. It was in this diverse community that he found his roots and sense of belonging. He eventually became student body president and was selected as boy mayor of the City of Los Angeles during his senior year.

While studying political science at Yale University, Dr. Nakanishi cofounded the *Amerasia Journal*, the top academic journal in the field of Asian American studies. He would continue his work on Asian American issues as a professor at UCLA, eventually becoming the Director for the Asian American Studies Center. It was at the Center that Dr. Nakanishi transformed the understanding of Asian American engagement in politics. When Dr. Nakanishi retired in 2009, the Center's faculty, students, and alumni worked together to establish an endowment in his honor. Every year, the "Don T Nakanishi Engaged Research Prize" is awarded to UCLA faculty and graduate students in Asian American Studies who are pursuing "outstanding, community-based research."

Throughout his distinguished career, he published over 100 books, reports, essays and articles about the political participation of Asian Americans and other minority ethnic and racial groups in the United States. His work influenced and contributed to the rise of Asian American participation in all levels of government and politics in the later part of the 20th century. In 1976, he began what is now known as the National Asian Pacific American Political Almanac, which lists every Asian American elected official across the nation, and has been called "an indispensable guide to Asian American politics."

Due to his accomplishments, President Bill Clinton eventually appointed Dr. Nakanishi to the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund Board of Directors, which administered a nationwide public education and research program designed to inform people of the history surrounding Japanese internment.

I was honored to teach the Asian American Contemporary Issues and the Asian American Women courses while Dr. Nakanishi was Director of the UCLA Asian American Studies Center. He was dedicated, insightful and compassionate, and I will always remember his incredible sense of humor, despite the seriousness of the many issues that we had to face.

Dr. Nakanishi was a devoted mentor to his students, a stalwart champion for Asian American scholars and activists, and a loving husband and father. The field of Asian American studies has lost one of its great leaders, and we will continue to honor his legacy and commitment to representation for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO RYAN OSBORN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ryan Osborn for being named a 2016 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, *Business Record*.

Since 2000, *Business Record* has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2016 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 640 business leaders and growing.

As the Director of Advancement at Dowling Catholic High School, Ryan has committed himself to improving the lives and education of his students. He worked tirelessly to bring funds to the school that allowed them to improve facilities and opportunities for each of the young people at Dowling Catholic High School. Ryan has also dedicated himself to his community through the Junior Achievement of Central Iowa program where he serves on the board of directors. His commitment to providing a high quality education for Iowa's young people along with his willingness to serve others is a true testament to his Iowa values.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Ryan in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Ryan on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at *Business Record* for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2016 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

THE RISE OF ISIS ESSAY BY KYLE CURTIS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight from across the political spectrum that sheds a light on the concerns of our younger constituents. Giving voice to their priorities will hopefully instill a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Kyle Curtis attends George Ranch High School in Richmond, Texas. The essay topic is: The rise of ISIS.

The rise of ISIS in the Iraq/Syria region has changed a lot of aspects of America as a whole. First off, it has re-entered the US into a war-torn region it has worked so hard to remove its military from in recent years. Also, ISIS poses a terrorist threat, not only in the Middle East, but also internationally, as is evident with the recent attack in Paris. And the US must find a new way of dealing with ISIS, as they have a larger network of terrorists residing in Western civilization, and possibly the US, than did other organizations such as Al Qaeda, which was made up of more tribal Islamic extremists. Also, ISIS uses the social network and Internet to plan attacks and recruit followers and people to carry out their plans, which is difficult for the US Government to put an end to, as deleting or arresting those taking part in these ordeals would go against the freedom of speech all American citizens are entitled to. Furthermore, ISIS is located in a prime economic region, as there are vast oil fields in the areas under ISIS' control, which they can pump out of the ground and sell it for money to fund their organization.

So the US faces a dilemma; how can you combat a terrorist organization that is spread out across the world and may even reside in your own backyard. This has allowed some presidential candidates for the 2016 election to take center-stage, with Donald Trump going as far as saying he will ban all Muslims from entering the US and build a wall on the American border. Another problem caused by ISIS' rise is the displacement of millions of people in the region from their home. The Syrian refugees who are being taken in by Jordan by the millions may also be taken in by the US, but any person can be disguised as a refugee, then the US may end up taking in terrorists who could commit some very terrible acts on American soil.

Nobody knows what will come of the recent rise of ISIS, whether it'll become a major enemy the US will have to fight in a war, or if it will subside and die off. Only time will tell, and hopefully Congress and the US military will be prepared to do whatever they need to if ISIS rises to endanger us or our country.

HONORING ETHEL C. MANGUM

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mrs. Ethel C. Mangum who is a native of Madison County. Many of her formative years were spent in the Virden Addition Area. She attended school at Walton Elementary and Brinkley High School. At Jackson State University she earned a B.S. and Masters degree in Social Work and Guidance.

For twenty-eight years she has been an active member of Farish Street Baptist Church and its E.B. Topp Missionary Circle.

Mrs. Mangum has done extensive volunteer work which included: teaching and reading at Powell Middle School; serving as Co-Chairperson of Lake Hico Eubanks Creek Neighborhood Association; working as an HIV/AIDS educator for the American Red Cross; working with children to prevent teenage pregnancy; and motivate them toward moral and academic excellence.

Mrs. Mangum has been a “first” in opening opportunities for others by becoming the first African American Woman to hold a professional position at Baptist Children’s Village; the first African American woman to work for Michael Baker, Jr., Inc. Consulting Engineers; and for SCAN (Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect). She was one of two females who integrated the lunch room at St. Dominic’s Hospital.

Mrs. Mangum currently strives for excellence in the community through her position as Administrative Assistant for Ward 3.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Ethel C. Mangum for her dedication to serving others.

SPYDERCO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2016

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Spyderco for receiving a Business Recognition Award from the Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation.

The Business Recognition Award is given to companies that show growth in primary employment, sales and/or capital investment in the last year. Spyderco designs and manufactures innovative knives and knife accessories including one-hand opening, serrations on a folder, and a clip to attach a knife to a pocket. In the company’s million-dollar testing facility, continuous testing enables the company to ex-

amine edge retention with a CATRA machine, look for rust development with Q-FOG, and test the force needed to open and close a knife. The company also repeatedly tests for stress, wear, optimal heat-treating and actively searches for higher quality, performance enhancing materials. Currently, the company has over 200 different products and produces knives across the globe in Japan, Taiwan, Italy and China.

Located in Golden, Spyderco recently expanded from 5,000 sq. ft. to 17,500 sq. ft. to keep up with increased demand for its products, as well as added 10 employees and \$1 million in capital investment to Jefferson County.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Spyderco for this well-deserved recognition by Jefferson County EDC. Thank you for your contributions to the Jefferson County economy and community.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2067–S2108

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2799–2805, and S. Res. 425–430. **Pages S2098–99**

Measures Reported:

S. 2804, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017. (S. Rept. No. 114–236)

S. 2390, to provide adequate protections for whistleblowers at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 2613, to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 2614, to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, to reauthorize the Missing Alzheimer’s Disease Patient Alert Program, and to promote initiatives that will reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism. **Page S2098**

Measures Passed:

Nevada Native Nations Land Act: Senate passed S. 1436, to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S2105–06**

National POW/MIA Remembrance Act: Senate passed H.R. 1670, to direct the Architect of the Capitol to place in the United States Capitol a chair honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action. **Page S2106**

Rutgers 250th Anniversary: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 311, honoring Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, as Rutgers celebrates its 250th anniversary, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S2106–07**

Financial Literacy Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 427, designating April 2016 as “Financial Literacy Month”. **Page S2107**

Congratulating the University of South Dakota Coyotes: Senate agreed to S. Res. 428, congratulating the 2016 national champions, the University of South Dakota Coyotes, for winning the 2016 Women’s National Invitation Tournament. **Page S2107**

National Assistant Principals Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 429, expressing support for the designation of the week of April 11 through April 15, 2016, as “National Assistant Principals Week”. **Page S2107**

Cheyenne Mountain Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 430, supporting the designation of April 20, 2016, as “Cheyenne Mountain Day”. **Page S2107**

Measures Considered:

Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2028, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016. **Pages S2067–68**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of 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 H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations. **Page S2067**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Friday, April 15, 2016, count as the intervening day with respect to the cloture motion on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. **Page S2107**

America’s Small Business Tax Relief Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2068–85**

Pending:

McConnell (for Thune/Nelson) Amendment No. 3679, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S2068**

Thune Amendment No. 3680 (to Amendment No. 3679), of a perfecting nature. **Page S2068**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 94 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. 45), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on McConnell (for Thune/Nelson) Amendment No. 3679 (listed above).

Page S2069

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, April 18, 2016, notwithstanding rule XXII, Thune Amendment No. 3680 (to Amendment No. 3679) (listed above) be agreed to, McConnell (for Thune/Nelson) Amendment No. 3679, as amended, be agreed to, and Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill.

Pages S2084–85

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, April 18, 2016, Senate resume consideration of the bill.

Page S2107

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Beth M. Andrus, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

J. Michael Diaz, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

Kathleen M. O'Sullivan, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

2 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

3 Army nominations in the rank of general.

1 Coast Guard nomination in the rank of admiral.

9 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, and Navy.

Page S2107–08

Messages from the House: Page S2098

Measures Referred: Page S2098

Enrolled Bills Presented: Page S2098

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S2098

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S2099–S2100

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S2100–03

Additional Statements: Pages S2097–98

Amendments Submitted: Pages S2103–05

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S2105

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—45) Page S2069

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:11 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday,

April 18, 2016. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2107.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to ensure protections of futures customers, to provide relief for farmers, ranchers, and end-users that manage risk to help keep consumer costs low.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original bill entitled, "Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2017";

An original bill entitled, "Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017"; and

302(b) Subcommittee allocations.

FIXED-INCOME MARKETS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment with the Subcommittee on Economic Policy concluded a joint hearing to examine current trends and changes in the fixed-income markets, including S. 881, to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on financial institutions, after receiving testimony from Jerome H. Powell, Member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and Antonio Weiss, Counselor to the Secretary of the Treasury.

KING COVE, ALASKA

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine options for addressing the continuing lack of reliable emergency medical transportation for the isolated community of King Cove, Alaska, after receiving testimony from Alaska Lieutenant Governor Byron Mallott, Juneau; Mayor Stanley Mack, Sand Point, Alaska; Denise Desiderio, National Congress of American Indians, Washington, D.C.; Nicole Whittington-Evans, The Wilderness Society, Anchorage, Alaska; Commander John Whiddon, USCG (Ret.), Kodiak, Alaska; and Della Trumble, King Cove, Alaska.

WASTE PREVENTION, PRODUCTION SUBJECT TO ROYALTIES, AND RESOURCES CONSERVATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Bureau of Land Management's proposed rule, entitled "Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resources Conservation," published in the Federal Register on February 8, 2016, after receiving testimony from Amanda Leiter, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land and Minerals Management; Todd Parfitt, Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality Director, Cheyenne; James Olguin, Southern Ute Indian Tribe, Ignacio, Colorado; Mark Boccella, FLIR Systems, Inc., Austin, Texas; and Kathleen Sgamma, Western Energy Alliance, Denver, Colorado.

OUR NATION'S BIODEFENSE

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Federal perspective on the state of our nation's biodefense, including multiple challenges in building and maintaining biodefense and biosurveillance, after receiving testimony from Richard J. Hatchett, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary and Acting Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority Director, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response, and Rear Admiral Stephen C. Redd, Director, Office of Public Health Preparedness and Response, Centers for Disease Control

and Prevention, both of the Department of Health and Human Services; Kevin Shea, Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture; Aaron Firoved, Senior Bio-defense Advisor, Office of Health Affairs, Department of Homeland Security; and Chris Currie, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2390, to provide adequate protections for whistleblowers at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2613, to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2614, to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, to reauthorize the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program, and to promote initiatives that will reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism; and

The nomination of Clare E. Connors, to be United States District Judge for the District of Hawaii.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 4936–4953; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 86; and H. Res. 680–683 were introduced.

Pages H1735–36

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H1737–38

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 4785, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to direct the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in managing the Department's vehicle fleet, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–494).

Page H1735

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Ribble to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H1683

Recess: The House recessed at 10:36 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Page H1687

Unanimous Consent Agreement: Agreed by unanimous consent that the question of adopting amendment No. 1 on H.R. 3791 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule 20.

Page H1691

Raising the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank holding company policy statement: The House passed H.R. 3791, to raise the consolidated assets threshold under the small bank

holding company policy statement, by a yea-and-nay vote of 247 yeas to 171 nays, Roll No. 149.

Pages H1691, H1712–13

Agreed to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair on a point of order sustained against the Moore motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 241 ayes to 177 noes, Roll No. 148.

Pages H1711–12

Rejected:

Kelly (IL) amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–489) that sought to limit the asset threshold increase to \$5 billion for bank holding companies and savings and loan holding companies which have submitted to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System a credible plan to expand access to banking accounts and services, consumer and small business credit products, and bank branches in rural, low-income, minority, and otherwise under-served communities (by a yea-and-nay vote of 165 yeas to 253 nays, Roll No. 147).

Pages H1697–99, H1710–11

H. Res. 671, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3340) and (H.R. 3791) was agreed to yesterday, April 13th.

Financial Stability Oversight Council Reform Act: The House passed H.R. 3340, to place the Financial Stability Oversight Council and the Office of Financial Research under the regular appropriations process, and to provide for certain quarterly reporting and public notice and comment requirements for the Office of Financial Research, by a yea-and-nay vote of 239 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 146.

Pages H1699, H1709–10

Agreed to table the appeal of the ruling of the chair on a point of order sustained against the Moore motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 239 yeas to 176 nays, Roll No. 145.

Pages H1708–09

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted.

Page H1699

Agreed to:

Royce amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–489) that requires the Office of Financial Research (OFR) of the Department of the Treasury to publish an annual work plan, develop and implement a cybersecurity plan, and collaborate with relevant regulatory agencies when preparing public reports, which shall also be subject to public notice and comment.

Pages H1706–08

H. Res. 671, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3340) and (H.R. 3791) was agreed to yesterday, April 13th.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on page H1690.

Quorum Calls Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1709, H1709–10, H1710–11, H1711–12, H1712. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FOCUS ON THE FARM ECONOMY: GROWING FARM FINANCIAL PRESSURE

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities and Risk Management held a hearing entitled “Focus on the Farm Economy: Growing Farm Financial Pressure”. Testimony was heard from Rob Johansson, Chief Economist, Department of Agriculture; and public witnesses.

UNITED STATES PACIFIC COMMAND

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held an oversight hearing on United States Pacific Command. Testimony was heard from Admiral Harry B. Harris, Jr., Commander, United States Pacific Command; and General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, Commander, United Nations Command, Combined Forces Command, United States Forces Korea. This hearing was closed.

THE MISSILE DEFEAT POSTURE AND STRATEGY OF THE UNITED STATES—THE FY17 PRESIDENT’S BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled “The Missile Defeat Posture and Strategy of the United States—the FY17 President’s Budget Request”. Testimony was heard from Brian McKeon, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense; Admiral Bill Gortney, USN, Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command, U.S. Northern Command; Vice Admiral James Syring, USN, Director, Missile Defense Agency; Barry Pike, Deputy Director, U.S. Army, PEO Missiles and Space; and Rear Admiral Edward Cashman, USN, Director, Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense Organization.

**INNOVATIONS IN HEALTH CARE:
EXPLORING FREE-MARKET SOLUTIONS
FOR A HEALTHY WORKFORCE**

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing entitled “Innovations in Health Care: Exploring Free-Market Solutions for a Healthy Workforce”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**OVERSIGHT OF THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY
TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION**

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration”. Testimony was heard from Mark Rosekind, Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held a hearing on H.R. 4775, the “Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2016”. Testimony was heard from Misael Cabrera, Director, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality; Alan Matheson, Executive Director, Utah Department of Environmental Quality; Ali Mirzakhali, Director, Division of Air Quality, Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control; Seyed Sadredin, Executive Director/Air Pollution Control Officer, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District; and Bryan W. Shaw, Chairman, Texas Commission of Environmental Quality.

**THE JOBS ACT AT FOUR: EXAMINING ITS
IMPACT AND PROPOSALS TO FURTHER
ENHANCE CAPITAL FORMATION**

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled “The JOBS Act at Four: Examining Its Impact and Proposals to Further Enhance Capital Formation”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
PATENT LITIGATION**

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled “International Trade Commission Patent Litigation”. Testimony was heard from Dominic Bianchi, General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice held a hearing on the

“Prenatal Nondiscrimination Act (PRENDA) of 2016”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 4901, the “Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Reauthorization Act”; H.R. 4902, to amend title 5, United States Code, to expand law enforcement availability pay to employees of U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s Air and Marine Operations; H.R. 4906, to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency, and for other purposes; H.R. 4921, the “Ditto Act of 2016”; H.R. 4904, the “Making Electronic Government Accountable By Yielding Tangible Efficiencies Act of 2016”; and H.R. 4465, the “Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016”. H.R. 4465 was ordered reported, as amended. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 4901, H.R. 4921, H.R. 4902, H.R. 4906, and H.R. 4904.

**CONNECTING VETERANS WITH PTSD
WITH SERVICE DOGS**

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled “Connecting Veterans with PTSD with Service Dogs”. Testimony was heard from Michael Fallon, Chief Veterinary Medical Officer, Office of Research and Development, Department of Veterans Affairs; Chris Crowe, Senior Mental Health Consultant/Liaison to the Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

**PROPOSED REFORMS TO RULE XXI AND
THE MODERN AUTHORIZATION AND
APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS**

Committee on Rules: Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House held a hearing on proposed reforms to Rule XXI and the modern authorization and appropriations process. Testimony was heard from Representatives McClintock, Griffith of Virginia, Price of North Carolina, and Cole.

**CAN THE IRS PROTECT TAXPAYERS’
PERSONAL INFORMATION?**

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled “Can the IRS Protect Taxpayers’ Personal Information?”. Testimony was heard from John Koskinen, Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service; J. Russell George, Inspector General, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration; and Gregory

Wilshusen, Director, Information Security Issues, Government Accountability Office.

REGULATION: THE HIDDEN SMALL BUSINESS TAX

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Regulation: The Hidden Small Business Tax”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MARITIME TRANSPORTATION SAFETY AND STEWARDSHIP PROGRAMS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled “Maritime Transportation Safety and Stewardship Programs”. Testimony was heard from Rear Admiral Paul Thomas, Deputy Commandant for Prevention Policy, U.S. Coast Guard; and public witnesses.

BLACKOUT! ARE WE PREPARED TO MANAGE THE AFTERMATH OF A CYBER-ATTACK OR OTHER FAILURE OF THE ELECTRICAL GRID?

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled “Blackout! Are We Prepared to Manage the Aftermath of a Cyber-Attack or Other Failure of the Electrical Grid?”. Testimony was heard from W. Craig Fugate, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency; Patricia A. Hoffman, Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability; Caitlin A. Durkovich, Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection, National Protection and Programs Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; Richard Campbell, Specialist in Energy Policy, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

EVALUATING VA IT: SCHEDULING MODERNIZATION AND CHOICE CONSOLIDATION

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Health; and Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, held a joint hearing entitled “Evaluating VA IT: Scheduling Modernization and Choice Consolidation”. Testimony was heard from David Shulkin, M.D., Under Secretary for Health, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and LaVerne Council, Assistant Secretary for Information and Technology and Chief Information Officer, Office of Information Technology, Department of Veterans Affairs.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing on H.R. 748, the “GI Bill STEM Extension Act of 2015”; H.R. 2551, the “Veterans' Entry to Apprenticeship Act”; H.R. 3286, the “HIRE Vets Act”; H.R. 3419, the “Support for Student Veterans with Families Act”; H.R. 4138, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup relocation expenses paid to or on behalf of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs; a draft bill to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to educational assistance, and for other purposes; a draft of the “Veterans Success on Campus Act of 2016”; a draft of the “GI Bill Oversight Act of 2016”; and a draft bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to carry out a research program to evaluate the effectiveness of Transition Assistance Program in addressing needs of certain minority veterans. Testimony was heard from Representatives McKinley; Cook; and McSally; Curtis L. Coy, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Opportunity, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Sam Shellenberger, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Operations, Veterans' Employment and Training Service, Department of Labor; and public witnesses.

THE TAX TREATMENT OF HEALTH CARE

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Tax Treatment of Health Care”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS TARIFF BILL: HELPING U.S. MANUFACTURERS THROUGH TAX CUTS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade held an organizational meeting; and a hearing entitled “Miscellaneous Tariff Bill: Helping U.S. Manufacturers through Tax Cuts”. The Subcommittee on Trade successfully organized. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM BUDGET HEARING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “General Defense Intelligence Program Budget Hearing”. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,
APRIL 15, 2016**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Evaluating DOD In-

vestments: Case Studies in Afghanistan Initiatives and U.S. Weapons Sustainment”, 9 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Unlawful Reinsurance Payments: CMS Diverting \$3.5 Billion from Taxpayers to Pay Insurance Companies”, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled “The Taxpayer Advocate Annual Report to Congress”, 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, April 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 636, America's Small Business Tax Relief Act (the legislative vehicle for the Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act). At 5:30 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, April 15

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 2666—No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E469
 Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E470
 Blackburn, Marsha, Tenn., E459
 Brady, Robert A., Pa., E464
 Buchanan, Vern, Fla., E461
 Burgess, Michael C., Tex., E475
 Calvert, Ken, Calif., E467
 Castor, Kathy, Fla., E465
 Chu, Judy, Calif, E471, E475
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E459
 Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E470
 Crenshaw, Ander, Fla., E461
 Davis, Danny K., Ill., E463
 DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E457
 DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E459
 Delaney, John K., Md., E456
 Denham, Jeff, Calif., E467

Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E457, E471
 Dold, Robert J., Ill., E464
 Fleischmann, Charles J. "Chuck", Tenn., E468
 Garamendi, John, Calif., E469, E474
 Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E471
 Grayson, Alan, Fla., E460
 Herrera Beutler, Jaime, Wash., E462
 Kelly, Trent, Miss., E457
 King, Steve, Iowa, E467, E473
 Kuster, Ann M., N.H., E457
 Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E474
 Lujan, Ben Ray, N.M., E456
 Lummis, Cynthia M., Wyo., E468
 MacArthur, Thomas, N.J., E461, E471
 Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E465
 McCollum, Betty, Minn., E472
 Murphy, Tim, Pa., E467
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E473

Olson, Pete, Tex., E455, E457, E460, E462, E464, E466, E467, E469, E473, E476
 Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E466
 Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E455, E458, E460, E463, E464, E466, E467, E472, E474, E477
 Ruppersberger, C. A. Dutch, Md., E463
 Sanford, Mark, S.C., E473
 Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E465
 Shuster, Bill, Pa., E456, E461
 Smith, Adam, Wash., E465
 Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E455, E458, E458, E460, E462, E465, E465, E468, E470, E472, E476
 Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E457
 Webster, Daniel, Fla., E456
 Wilson, Joe, S.C., E459
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E475
 Young, David, Iowa, E455, E458, E460, E462, E464, E466, E468, E469, E473, E476



Congressional Record

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.