



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2015

No. 93

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 11, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

BUILDING A TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE FUTURE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that after 55 months in control, my Republican friends have scheduled their first hearing on transportation and finance. This is a very important, very welcome development, as welcome as it is long overdue. I appreciate my friend, PAUL RYAN, the chairman of the committee, keeping his

word that we would actually have a hearing.

Now, the question is whether this is going to be one that is more or less perfunctory, sort of a plain vanilla, or whether it is going to be the start of a critical dialogue involving not just ideologues, but the people who do more than just study the issue, hear from the vast army of people who plan, build, maintain, and use our transportation infrastructure. There is a unique, shared, forceful vision. Congress should spend the time not just to listen to those stakeholders, but to understand how they got to where they are and what we need to do.

We shouldn't settle for half steps to just get past the next transportation deadline, which is looming next month, which would be the 34th short-term extension. Just as bad or worse, we would fail to give the country the bold transportation investment that is so sorely needed.

The next hearings are even more important following next Wednesday's effort. That is the time to actually follow regular order, to debate real options.

I have introduced a path. After 20 years of working on transportation funding, it is still the simplest, the best, and the most widely supported. It is the widest coalition, in fact, of any major issue confronting people on Capitol Hill. It includes the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, contractors, transit, local government, bicyclists, engineers. It includes the AAA, representing automobile users, and the American Trucking Association. They all support, for the first time in 22 years, raising the Federal gas tax.

We are in the problem we are in now because we are paying for 2015 transportation needs with 1993 dollars. It doesn't work.

My approach would not just raise the gas tax, index the gas tax, but work to

abolish the gas tax because it is no longer a sustainable long-term solution. We can, in fact, replace it with a much more viable, effective, fair system based on road user charges, which we are experimenting with in Oregon, and States around the country are looking at.

In the meantime, we ought to step up and do our job on the gas tax. It is interesting that six red States have already raised the gas tax this year. If it was good enough for Eisenhower, if it was good enough for Ronald Reagan, who used his Thanksgiving Day speech in 1982 to summon Congress back to more than double the gas tax, which he and Tip O'Neill did, it ought to be good enough for us today.

Let's discuss, examine, and understand all the viable solutions, the health of our infrastructure, our economy, and the impacts on the people we serve.

Whatever solution we come up with must meet three tests: It must raise enough to do the job of giving America its first 6-year transportation bill since 1998; it must be dedicated to allow the certainty to be able to build a transportation vision for the future; and it must be sustainable so that we don't end up back in the same place in a year or 2 or 4 or even 5.

My legislation would provide 210 additional billion dollars, enough for the transportation committee to fashion that vision for the future. It is ironclad dedicated over the next 6 years, but it is sustainable because, if Congress hasn't moved to abolish the gas tax by then, at least we don't fall off a cliff.

There was a time when America had the best infrastructure in the world. Sadly, that time has passed. There was a time when infrastructure used to be bipartisan. I am hopeful that if we step up to the plate, approach it in a bipartisan fashion, we can do the job so that we start repairing infrastructure that is now rated 25th or 27th in the world, and going down.

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.

H4163

We no longer have the finest infrastructure, but we can be bipartisan and thoughtful. We can reverse this 20-year slide. We can put hundreds of thousands of people to work across America at family-wage jobs this year and rebuild and renew America so our families are safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

WE NEED THE RIGHT TRACK, NOT THE FAST TRACK

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, TPA, TPP, TTIP, WTO, GATT, fast track, to the American people, we have made the ability to understand trade relations with other nations nigh on impossible.

Politicians, pundits, and prophetic economists are issuing clarion calls to free trade. We all like free trade, but these same advocates insist that we do it fast, you know, put it on a fast track with "trade promotional authority." Listening to these experts, they insist that we cannot do trade without it. Never mind that for 160 years we negotiated without it under the guide of the Constitution and the watchful eye of the Representatives of the people.

Now, they want the negotiations to be secret: Don't worry. The trade agreements are complex. They will give us the final agreement, and we will have a little bit of time to look it over. Can't change it. Just look it over, and then you can have a simple up-or-down vote that could bind America to the terms of other nations.

"But it will create jobs?" they say, just like NAFTA, just like the world trade agreement, just like CAFTA. We were reassured then that those would fix everything. We passed them. We are still waiting for those jobs.

Americans need to ask a few questions of us in this body before we commit to something that could have decades of impact.

The Pacific Partnership includes a transnational commission with a living agreement clause to change it. Why would we surrender congressional authority of a two-thirds vote to stand guard against something that could clearly damage our laws and Nation?

Why would we want to isolate China, possibly driving them toward Russia, and create cold war II. The Army Chief of Staff saw a need this week to ease tensions with China. Why would we want to increase them with anti-Chinese trade rhetoric? You think military spending is high now; try it in a cold war or worse. Let's trade with China instead, not make them our adversary.

Even a partial pruning of commercial links or even a gradual upsurge in Western protectionism toward China would have a profound impact on the world's well-being. Why would we pursue a path that most likely creates tension that could spill over in other areas with devastating consequences, sending ripples throughout the world?

The current President's talent for negotiation among nations should be measured by his foreign policy. Have we forgotten the line in the sand, the arming of al Qaeda and other nefarious Syrian rebels to fight Assad, only to watch them become ISIS, and then dismiss them as a JV team, only to see them tear through Iraq, which fell apart after we abandoned it, after we were assured that they could stand on their own if we left early? Now, there is no strategy to fix it. Then there is the Arab Spring, which has morphed into the potential for a nuclear winter with Iran. Let's not forget Crimea and Ukraine. I can go on.

The question is: Why are we? Like Lucy holding the football, we are told that the President needs the power to negotiate. If we just come and take a kick at it, all will be well.

Much is at stake. National security, American jobs, capital, manufacturing, pharmaceuticals, agricultural, and, contrary to economic theorists, even American law. One only has to look at the case of Australia's law that made generic packaging required on cigarettes. The law was challenged by a cigarette company who went treaty shopping by using its Hong Kong subsidiary and was able to interfere with Australia's law because of her treaty with Hong Kong.

Perhaps most concerning is all the anti-Chinese rhetoric. China is an enormous trading partner, a holder of large amounts of U.S. Treasury bonds that have kept interest rates low and our purchasing power at the store high. They are not our enemy. Yet the rhetoric coming from the White House and the architects of the TPA bill seem set on anti-Chinese dictums to make their case.

We need China. China needs us. Let's establish some rules of the road as competitors rather than laying the track for the smashup derby. It will take time, it will be hard, but dialogue and diplomacy are better than tanks and Tomahawks. We can do this without turning it into a foreign policy disaster that gives the President and Congress a chance to make China our enemy.

We can engage without granting TPA, but we have to lead. TPA without leadership is less valuable than leadership without TPA. Among the proposed Pacific Partnership's 11 other nations, we already have high-standard, free trade agreements with seven of them. We do not have to subject ourselves to this multilateral trade treaty to work with them, and we certainly should not do it fast by granting TPA to a President that has exhibited poor leadership in foreign affairs.

We need the right track, not the fast track.

WORST TRADE AGREEMENT IN A 20-YEAR HISTORY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the House of Representatives will be asked to grease the skids for the last and worst trade agreement in a 20-year history of job-killing trade agreements. I say "last" because this is a new concept. It is a living trade agreement. Anybody can access to it in the future. All they have to do is say: We pretend—or will pretend—to follow the very weak rules of this trade agreement.

When the President began the negotiations, China was concerned because he talked about the pivot to Asia, confronting China. Now China is saying: Hey, we want in. This is great. We know how to game it. We can take away the last of your manufacturing, and we are not going to let it just go to Japan who is already in the agreement.

The worst, for many reasons, but among them is something called the investor-state dispute resolution process. What is that? It means there will be a special private court set up for corporations to challenge our domestic laws, any and all domestic laws, that they find to be trade restrictive.

Now, the President came to Oregon and said those of us who are critical of this are making things up because we said they can repeal otherwise. Now, the President danced on the head of a rhetorical pin there, a bit duplicitously. He is right. They can't make us repeal our laws. We can pay to keep them.

Yes, you heard that right. We can pay to keep our laws that protect consumers, and we can pay to protect our laws that protect the environment or labor or Buy America or anything else. We can keep them if we want to pay.

Here are four examples:

Yesterday, the House of Representatives repealed requirements that meat, poultry be labeled as to country of origin. American consumers would kind of like to know. We have got enough problems in our own industry here. We would like to know if this stuff is coming overseas from someplace where maybe the sanitary conditions aren't quite so good. Well, we lost a trade dispute on that issue.

Now, we could keep the law if we wanted to pay billions of dollars or, no, a Republican rush to repeal the law. It makes a few giant agribusiness companies happy. Of course, it kind of sticks it to the domestic producers who know they are producing a good product. That is one loss.

Brazilian cotton, now, this is a funny one. We provide these bizarre subsidies through our foreign program, and one of them goes to cotton.

□ 1015

We were found to be subsidizing, therefore, putting Brazil at a disadvantage. For years, we paid Brazil \$147 million a year so we could keep subsidizing our cotton producers. Isn't that great?

Yeah, we kept our law; we just cost us \$147 million to subsidize the cotton

producers. Last year, we got a settlement out of them. They are going to give us a 3-year grace. We gave them a one-time \$300 million penalty, and they won't challenge it again until 2018.

Now, Mexican trucks—personally involved in this one—they don't have meaningful driver's licenses; they don't have hours of service standards; they don't have drug testing; they don't have alcohol testing, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, so we didn't want them ranging around the United States of America. We passed a bill almost unanimously in the House to prevent that.

Mexico went to one of these secret tribunals; they won. The Obama administration caved under threats of billions of dollars of punitive tariffs against the U.S. to allow those Mexican trucks free and permanent access to the highways of the United States of America.

You are right, we can't. You are right, Mr. President—no, you are not right, Mr. President; actually, you are wrong on that one.

One last one, dolphin-safe tuna—now, we just wanted to say the Mexicans go out and slaughter dolphins to catch tuna. They cast the nets over the dolphins who swim on top of the tuna. There are some people who thought: well, hey, it would be good marketing for StarKist and others if we had dolphin-safe tuna, where people don't slaughter dolphins to get the tuna.

Well, Mexico won a trade dispute saying: no, you can't do that, that is trade restricted; you can pay us not to slaughter dolphins, or we can slaughter dolphins, and you can't label those cans as dolphin-safe tuna.

Yeah, the President is sort of, kind of technically right. They can't force us to repeal our laws. They can just blackmail us to repeal our laws in secret tribunals.

Now, the ones I mentioned are under a state-to-state resolution. The TPP that this trade promotion authority facilitates allows corporations special standing to go to a special private secret tribunal, only available to corporations, to challenge our laws.

Just think of the mischief in the future. One will certainly be pharmaceuticals. Most certainly, they will challenge the requirement that we negotiate lower drug prices for our veterans and people on Medicaid, and they will win.

The President is right; we won't have to repeal the subsidies for those drugs or the reduced price. We can just pay the pharmaceutical industry tens of billions of dollars to keep providing affordable drugs to veterans and seniors.

This is a great day for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

WIMBERLEY, TEXAS, IS MAKING A COMEBACK

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, up until several weeks ago, my State of Texas experienced a drought so severe that water levels were reduced to historic lows while conservation efforts were set to all-time highs. Lakes and reservoirs were bone dry. Wildfires were a constant threat.

In a cruel twist of fate, Texas is now recovering from the worst flooding in recent memory. Rivers overflowed, and dams burst.

In Wimberley, Texas, a town about 40 miles southwest of the Texas capital, water rushed over the banks of the Blanco River with enough force to rip houses off their foundations and carry cars like they were toys. Loved ones were lost. Belongings and memories were washed away.

The last month has been marked by death, destruction, and disbelief. I have met with first responders, toured flood damage, and spoke to the National Guard and regional FEMA officers about response and recovery operations. My office established a response center in town to help with the recovery process.

Although we are still in a period of mourning, the strong Texas spirit of resolve has proven more powerful than Mother Nature's fury. Just this week, a nearby newspaper ran the headline, "Hard hit by flood, Wimberley assures tourists: We're open for business." I personally might add "wide open for business."

Mr. Speaker, this is the Texas way; it is what we do. Today, just a few weeks since the rains eased and the floodwaters subsided, Wimberley is making a comeback. Nearly all of the businesses in downtown Wimberley have reopened.

Cathy Moreman, the executive director of the Wimberley Valley Chamber of Commerce, told my office they have had offers of help from around the country. Locals and visitors alike have come in and out and offered much in help from rescue to cleanup efforts. She said the outpouring of support has been astounding.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I mean when I cite the Texas spirit of resolve. We have and will continue to take care of each other, look out for our neighbors, and together push forward.

I assure you, we will rebound from this tragedy quickly and fully.

May God bless the residents of Wimberley, and may God bless all of Texas.

In God we trust.

KING KAMEHAMEHA

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today, in my home State of Hawaii, we are

celebrating King Kamehameha Day to honor the legacy of King Kamehameha I, who established the Kingdom of Hawaii in 1810.

King Kamehameha knew that for a nation to be vibrant, its citizens must feel safe and secure. He proclaimed the Kanawai Mamalahoe, the Law of the Splintered Paddle, as the law of the land. This law, still enshrined in the Hawaii State Constitution today, protects the unalienable rights of all men and women to be safe and secure in their home.

Kamehameha also knew that, to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of his people, it was imperative to create economic opportunities. He invested resources to maintain viable fish ponds and taro patches, protect freshwater streams, fertile soils, and forestlands; he built schools and trained an entire new generation of leaders.

As we observe Kamehameha Day, it is a true day of aloha for the people of Hawaii. Those who are visiting the Capitol this week may have seen the many fragrant and beautiful flower leis draped on the statue of King Kamehameha in Emancipation Hall.

All this week, in Hawaii, across the State, there will be further lei-draping ceremonies taking place to pay homage to the legacy of Hawaii's first King.

As legislators, we are called upon to embody the servant leadership and the humility of leaders like King Kamehameha I.

IRS RESPONSE LETTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the IRS response letter that was sent to me and 51 of my colleagues asking for an investigation of the Clinton Foundation's tax-exempt status.

Now, the IRS responded to us with a letter. It is dated May 21. What we received back, Mr. Speaker, from the IRS was simply a form letter. It was addressed, "Dear Sir or Madam," not even my name. The director of the Exempt Organizations Examinations didn't even take the time to sign the letter.

What we have is this: the IRS has so little respect for Members of Congress who are asking a question, who are seeking clarity on behalf of their constituents, that they respond to a congressional inquiry with a letter that is a form letter, not even signed. Well, you can imagine that we were a little bit surprised by this.

I think it is important to talk about why we were asking for clarity on the Clinton Foundation and their tax-exempt status. We all have 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organizations that do great work in our communities. Many of these organizations had come to us—their Member of Congress—and said: What do you know about how the Clinton Foundation works? What about

these foreign donations that are coming into the Clinton Foundation?

We were continuing to look at this because when you go to charitynavigator.org, which many of our colleagues or our constituents would do, and you pull up, you enter in the search engine “the Bill, Hillary, and Chelsea Clinton Foundation,” what comes up is this:

We don't evaluate Bill, Hillary, and Chelsea Clinton Foundation. Why not? We have determined that this charity's atypical business model cannot be accurately captured in our current rating methodology.

How interesting is that; how very interesting. The American people are wanting to know how this charity keeps a not-for-profit status and how they conduct business. It is appropriate that we write the IRS and ask for clarity on this situation, doing it on behalf of our constituents who are seeking answers to questions.

Now, I have to tell you, we know that there is no shortage of pens in the executive branch of this government. The President has said he has got a pen and a phone and he will work around Congress if he needs to. We understand that.

We know they have pens over at the IRS. We know that they have just chosen to dismiss what we have asked for, which is clarity. We have a divided government; we have a system of checks and balances, and we do expect to have a response from the IRS that addresses the structure of this organization.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to follow this issue. We have found it quite amusing that this is how they would choose to address the inquiry and that this is the attitude that they are taking.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, TAX EXEMPT AND GOVERNMENT ENTITIES DIVISION,

May 21, 2015.

Hon. MARSHA BLACKBURN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR OR MADAM: Thank you for the information you submitted regarding The Bill, Hillary and Chelsea Clinton Foundation. The Internal Revenue Service has an ongoing examination program to ensure that exempt organizations comply with the applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. The information you submitted will be considered in this program.

Internal Revenue Code section 6103 protects the privacy of tax returns and tax return information of all taxpayers. Therefore, we cannot disclose the status of any investigation. If, at a later date, you have additional information that you believe is relevant to this matter, please attach a copy of this letter to the information and send it to the address shown above.

We appreciate your concern in bringing this matter to our attention. If you have additional questions, please call Customer Account Services.

Sincerely,

MARGARET VON LIENEN,
Director, Exempt Organizations
Examinations.

CONGRESS MUST SUPPORT PROBLEM-SOLVERS OF TOMORROW

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, recently, I visited Warrenton High School in a small coastal community in my district in beautiful northwest Oregon.

I met with students who were working on an underwater robotics team. These talented students are running simulation experiments in a pool in preparation for the Marine Advanced Technology Education competition.

This year, students were asked to maneuver their underwater robots to retrieve items like algae and sea urchins from the ocean floor. This hands-on learning fosters collaboration and creativity in students and helps them see the connections between what is in their textbook and how it translates to practical work that can make a difference for our planet.

Perhaps more importantly, this kind of activity builds problem-solving skills and shows students that trial and error is a natural part of growth and discovery and learning.

After visiting the underwater robotics team, I joined students at their school's fish hatchery, where they raise salmon for release into local waterways. This program provides opportunities for students to develop skills in biology, water chemistry, engineering, and natural resources management and contributes to our ability to sustain an economically and culturally important fishery; importantly, it also gives them valuable skills and leadership in management.

In the United States, we face a growing shortage of innovative workers, people who are prepared to tackle the challenges of the future. This is an especially serious problem because we absolutely must grapple with one of the greatest environmental threats this Nation has faced, climate change.

Today, too many students, particularly young women and minorities, lack access and opportunities to engage in this hands-on kind of STEM learning occurring at Warrenton High School. Here in Congress, we must be doing more to foster and support students who have become the problem-solvers of tomorrow. Doing so makes economic sense and environmental sense.

We need smart, passionate students to help understand environmental challenges and changes, to develop the technology to address our growing impact on our planet, and to find more sustainable practices.

Oregon is home to some excellent research universities. The University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Oregon Health & Science University are all working on a wide range of research and development programs to help combat and adapt to climate change.

These universities are conducting the basic science we need to understand

and anticipate changes and trends, as well as the applied science to help use existing information to develop practical tools and technologies to meet the challenges presented by climate change.

They model changes caused by sea level rise; they help shellfish hatcheries adapt to ocean acidification, or they develop new types of biofuel. This is exciting, important research; and we need smart, passionate young people to take up this mantle.

□ 1030

June is National Oceans Month. This month, we recognize the value of our oceans, lakes, and coastline, and we recommit to protecting these bodies of water.

I would also like to recommit to developing and investing in technologies to help stop and begin to repair the damage we have done to our oceans, our coasts, and our ecosystems. Improved and innovative technology development in areas such as renewable energy and water conservation have the power to make a real difference for our planet and for current and future generations, but we can't do it without people like smart, skilled students who will become the workers in the workforce of tomorrow.

Those students in Warrenton, Oregon, and others like them are our future leaders and problem-solvers. Let's help do all we can to make sure that they have the tools and the resources they need today as students and tomorrow as scientists, engineers, and innovators who can meet the complex challenges ahead and turn them into productive opportunities that will better their communities, their States, our country, and the world.

HIPAA CHANGES IN THE HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as part of my 3-year investigation into the Nation's mental health system, I have been meeting with families and caregivers of those with mental illness. Their number one concern is the HIPAA privacy rule. Since its inception in 2002, the rule has generated nearly 70,000 complaints.

Families are locked out from helping in treatment by Federal regulations that don't understand the complexity of treating a serious mental illness in someone who has other medical problems, like diabetes or lung disease or skin problems or other illnesses that require treatment. When you have those with the diminished capacity to follow through on their own care, should we just let them languish and suffer? Should we let their mental illness and poor medical care become what some consider to be a slow-motion suicide?

If a family member has a head injury or a stroke or Alzheimer's illness, a doctor would not hesitate to explain the medical concerns to a family member. A doctor would do this because the doctor recognizes the brain illness can make the individual unable to clearly understand the severity of his illness. According to the current HIPAA laws, when a child is in severe psychosis, the doctor is unable to tell the parents anything.

We must recognize that severe mental illness like schizophrenia, bipolar, and severe depression is brain disease—it is not an attitude. It is not something cured by pulling oneself up by the bootstraps no more than dementia is cured by a different outlook on life or by a motivational poster. We cannot continue to make care the most difficult for those who have the most difficulty in caring for themselves. This has to change. There is merit to those 70,000 complaints, and we must address them compassionately.

The Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 2646, allows the doctor or mental health professional to provide the diagnosis, treatment plans, appointment scheduling, and prescriptions for an individual with a serious mental illness to a known caregiver. This change would apply to those who can benefit from care yet who are unable to follow through on their own self-directed care.

Put yourself in the shoes of a family member. Imagine yourself trying to help a parent or a sibling or a child, and a caseworker who doesn't even know your family member can't help you because he is bound from letting you—a loving and caring parent—help your son or daughter. The law puts you behind this heartless barrier where you have to passively watch your child wither away. But what parent would not run into a burning building or throw himself in front of a car to save his child? Yet, with our current HIPAA laws, you have to watch and suffer along with your child.

We have to change this, and H.R. 2646 does make this important change. My legislation does not allow for the sharing of psychotherapy notes or of personal conversations between a therapist and a patient. It is limited to the information that is essential to caring for someone with a serious mental illness to make sure he stays in care. Let's make it easier. Let's make it more compassionate for those who need help the most. I urge my colleagues to please support H.R. 2646 and to sign on as cosponsors.

GENESIS WITH REVELATIONS YET TO COME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is always a preeminent privilege to stand in the well of the House of Representatives to advocate on behalf

of my constituents in the Ninth Congressional District of Texas, but it is also a greater honor to advocate on behalf of the American people. I contend that no one could have predicted that I would have had this great opportunity at my birth, and I am always grateful to have it, and I want people to know that I appreciate it greatly.

Mr. Speaker, last night, the House of Representatives passed a bipartisan piece of legislation, H. Res. 295. This is a resolution that would encourage law enforcement agencies to use body cameras. It passed overwhelmingly, and I am here today to express my gratitude to the many Members who supported this piece of legislation.

I would like to start with the leadership. I am honored that the leadership supported it because, without the support of leadership, legislation does not come to the floor.

Mr. BOEHNER, I am grateful that you supported and allowed it to come to the floor.

Ms. PELOSI, I am grateful that you supported and allowed it to come to the floor.

Mr. HOYER, I am honored that we had the opportunity to visit with you about it as well as with other members of leadership, including Mr. BOEHNER, and that you allowed it to come to the floor.

I also want to mention the chair of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE. He allowed us to visit with him about this legislation. We are grateful that he participated in the process and allowed it to come to the floor.

I am also especially honored to mention Mr. CONYERS, the sage of the House of Representatives, the dean of the House of Representatives, and I am grateful that he has been understanding and has given us the opportunity to have this piece of legislation come to the floor in the form of a resolution.

There were Members who supported this, and they were cosponsors. I have to mention my very dear friend Mr. CLEAVER. I will say candidly that, without him, we wouldn't have been able to have succeeded. He has been a partner with me on this legislation, and we have worked through the entirety of the process.

I will mention Mr. TED POE from Texas. He and I were lawyers together, and we were judges together. He was the first person to actually sign onto the resolution, and that meant something to have his support.

Mr. POE, I am grateful that you signed on as the first original cosponsor, and my prayer is that this piece of legislation is something that you will be proud of in the years to come.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER signed onto it, Mr. LACY CLAY, Mr. YODER, and Ms. CLARKE—all persons who were original cosponsors of the legislation. I am grateful that they chose to allow their names to be associated with it, and I am grateful to all of the Members of the House of Representatives who voted for it, some 421 Members.

Let me now just focus on the legislation for just a moment and remind everybody that this, in a metaphorical sense, is not the end; it is the beginning. In a metaphorical sense, it is not the closing argument as we might have in a trial; it is the opening statement. As a Christian, in a metaphorical sense, this is Genesis; it is not Revelation. There are many other things to come. In fact, we have a piece of legislation—the CAM TIP Act—that is currently pending before the House, and my hope is that we will get some additional cosponsors on that piece of legislation.

As for this piece of legislation, let me announce that what it does is to simply provide encouragement to law enforcement agencies to know that the consensus of the House of Representatives is that you have body cameras. We ask that you please consider the rationale for body cameras.

One, transparency. This means that there won't be disputes about what happened. With cameras, you can still have some disputes. This is not a panacea; it will not cure all that ails some of our concerns. Yet it does provide some empirical evidence, empirical evidence that we would not acquire otherwise because of the contentions that can be at odds with each other about facts. By the way, as a judge, I know that you can have persons with the best of intentions who can see the same facts and come away with different conclusions as to what occurred. This provides the additional transparency.

It also provides an opportunity for us to allow this evidence to go into court. It is not enough for the public to see what is going on. Those who serve as jurors will have an opportunity to see what happened and base their decisions on more than what one person says as opposed to what another person says.

I am proud to tell you that the piece of legislation will provide an opportunity for people to adjust their behavior. A wonderful thing can happen when cameras are on. People will know that they are being watched, and they can adjust their behavior.

I am so honored that the legislation has passed, and I am grateful for the opportunity to speak this morning. I thank those who were supportive of it. This is the genesis. The revelations are yet to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members.

IN SUPPORT OF CUBAN HISTORIAN GUSTAVO PEREZ SILVERIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to support Gustavo Perez Silverio, an historian in Cuba who has had to endure continued threats from Castro's state security forces.

This week, Castro's thugs threatened Gustavo Perez Silverio by telling him that he would be prosecuted for terrorist activities, but his only crime was to support activism and engagement in Cuban civil society. That is not a crime. This is not the first time he has had to endure these dire threats.

While in the United States last year, Gustavo issued statements about the current difficult situation in Cuba for human rights, but when he returned to the island, he learned that he lost his job as a professor at the university where he was teaching. This is another attempt by the Castro regime to silence peaceful opposition leaders.

We cannot let this continue. What is happening to Gustavo happens to dozens of Cubans every day, innocent but brave dissidents who try to speak the truth about the human rights violations occurring in Cuba, violations that go unpunished due to the undeserved concessions given to the Castro brothers by this administration. Let's stand with the oppressed, the brave dissidents like Gustavo Perez Silverio, and not stand with their oppressor, the Castro regime.

CLAUDIA PUIG

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to honor Claudia Puig, a leader in television and radio broadcasting, on her receipt of the Bill Brooks Award from the Florida Association of Broadcasters.

Claudia is a prominent figure in our south Florida community, and with over 25 years of experience, her opinion is trusted and credible. Claudia has been recognized by Radio Ink magazine as one of the 50 Most Influential Women in Radio and has been honored as Manager of the Year with the prestigious Medallas de Cortez Award in 2012. Claudia has served on many prestigious boards, including Florida International University's Board of Trustees, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the Orange Bowl Committee.

For those of us who know her, the Bill Brooks Award is a deserved honor and a testament to her hard work.

Congratulations, Claudia. I wish you many more years of continued success.

22ND ANNIVERSARY OF AMIGOS FOR KIDS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Amigos for Kids, an organization in my congressional district that works to mitigate the harmful effects of child abuse and neglect. It has now embarked on its 22nd year of service to families in my congressional district in south Florida.

As part of its mission, this noble organization, Amigos for Kids, administers an afterschool program at Jose Marti Park in Little Havana that provides kids with academic and extracurricular enrichment activities. Funded by the Children's Trust, Amigos for Kids also offers workshops to fortify the family bond. On June 20, Amigos for Kids will host its annual Miami Celebrity Domino Night. It is an event at which guests will enjoy live entertain-

ment and culinary delights, which will benefit these kids.

I thank Amigos for Kids for its commitment to assisting the less fortunate, and I encourage our community to get involved for the betterment of children and families. A united community can make a positive and lasting difference for all of us.

□ 1045

RAISING ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS IN JUNE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, June is Alzheimer's Awareness Month, and I rise today to shed light on one of the fastest growing and costliest epidemics facing our Nation. Having lost my mother due to complications of Alzheimer's, I am all too familiar with how it impacts not only the person, but the person's loved ones and the caregivers.

Over 5.3 million Americans are living with this disease, including half a million Floridians. The Alzheimer's Association projects that, within the next 10 years, every State will experience significant increases in the number of people living with Alzheimer's. That means skyrocketing healthcare costs for impacted families and across all levels of government.

Research is our best hope to save taxpayer dollars, and most importantly, to save lives. My thanks to all who are working every day toward curing Alzheimer's, a devastating disease. I also thank them for improving the patient's well-being and the caregiver's.

THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM AND POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased this morning to speak about a topic that I really believe there is a strong pathway forward. I have said often, as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, that as we look at the criminal justice system with a myriad of issues that have come to our attention from the American public, from asset forfeiture to mens rea to a number of issues dealing with police interaction with the community, this is a significant moment in America's history.

We are a nation of laws, and we pride ourselves with understanding the very words of the Declaration of Independence that clearly says that we all are created equal with certain inalienable rights of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The beginning words of the Constitution say that our Founding Fathers—although imperfect in many of the aspects of the Constitution based upon rights not given to women and rights not given to African Americans—did say that they formed this government to create a more perfect Union.

Now, in 2015, we have an opportunity, again, as I said, to assess the criminal

justice system in many ways. Let me cite for you some of the challenges that we face. For example, a 16-year-old in New York who was arrested for taking a knapsack—he shouldn't have taken a knapsack—was thrown into Rikers Island and had a \$3,000 bail, which he or his family could not pay. He stayed in isolation for 3 years. His case never came before the courts. The lawyers obviously were backlogged, whatever court-appointed lawyer he might have had. During that time, there was abuse, and this youngster suffered. At 19 going on 20, he was finally released, no action taken against him. Tragically, 2 weeks after he was released, this young man committed suicide.

We understand the brain does not mature to its fullest before the age of 24 or 25, and so when you are dealing with teenagers between 18 and 24, you are dealing with kids. You are dealing with individuals who have yet formulated their full judgment.

These incidents, along with the cases of Walter Scott and Freddie Gray, begin to have us question how we make better our law enforcement. As we mourn those who have fallen in duty—and we do, as I have over the years—I recognize that we must give skills training and give more resources for professional development and change the concept that we have forced our law enforcement to be in.

We have forced the concept of warrior versus guardian. Maybe that caused the incident of the gentleman who was in his doorstep in suburban Virginia, right outside of Washington, D.C. I think the case was 3 years ago where the gentleman came to the door. Of course he was having a disagreement with the officer who was at the door, but he wound up dead in his doorstep. Of course the family settled because there was, in essence, an inappropriate use of excessive force and it did not have to happen.

As we work in the Committee on the Judiciary and work with Members, I am looking forward to finding a significant moment. We will be introducing legislation dealing with police accountability—we hope it will draw a number of Members' bipartisan support—using this concept of guardian versus warrior, giving the amount of resources for training, but also giving the necessary equipment that will be helpful, new technology, and a criteria utilized by small departments that will allow them to get a rating of having a police force that meets certain standards to know how to deal with the elderly, to know how to deal with the physically and mentally disabled, how to deal with juveniles, how to deal with women. Certainly we know that bad actors and those who are tending to do us harm, we are ultimately concerned that we have very safe communities.

I hope that as we confront this that the sheer shrillness of dealing with criminal justice will be put aside so that we can studiously get a bill to the

President's desk, we can get a bill about youth offenders that I will introduce, a bill about building trust, which means that we don't force communities to use police officers as revenue gatherers, so it is not about how many we stop on the street or how many we give tickets to to provide money to the coffers of our local community. That puts the police sometimes in unnecessary confrontational roles when they could very well be engaging in warnings or other ways of dealing with the community. I would like to enhance PAL, the Police Athletic League, an excellent community-based approach to police and children getting to know each other. Many things can happen.

This is a significant moment that captures the constitutional premise that we want to create a more perfect Union.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, chained to a bed in a warehouse, branded like cattle, these are just some of the horrific stories that I have heard from young girls who suffered as victims of human trafficking in my home State of Texas.

Human trafficking is modern-day slavery. Sadly, according to the National Human Trafficking Resource Center, Texas has the second highest number of reported instances of human trafficking in the country. My hometown of Houston is the hub for domestic trafficking of minor children.

While this dastardly underground industry has been hidden for years in plain sight, the good news is there are efforts to fight this scourge of human trafficking throughout the Nation. Earlier this week Senator CORNYN and I had the opportunity to visit the Letot Center in Dallas, Texas, where we saw firsthand what can happen when government, law enforcement, nonprofits, concerned citizens, and religious groups join together in a community to restore the lives of human trafficking victims.

We were joined by advocates from the nonprofit New Friends New Life, an organization that provides job training, financial assistance, life skills coaching, and special programs to address the challenges of survivors and their families. With the addition of a brand-new all-female facility, the Letot Center and groups like New Friends New Life not only provide a safe home for trafficking victims, but help arm them with the resources to rebuild their lives.

One remarkable young lady that we met—I will call her Amanda because that is her name—became a victim of human trafficking after she was kidnapped in Dallas at the age of 15. For 9 years she lived in slavery, in terror, as she was repeatedly sold every day for sex.

Through New Friends New Life's approach, one that addresses the physical, mental, and spiritual needs of victims, Amanda was rescued, and she and her daughter are now living proof that there is hope for trafficking survivors fighting abuse, addiction, and poverty. After talking to her and hearing her story and she making her story public, Mr. Speaker, she is a remarkable person—a survivor, a fighter against the scourge of slavery.

As a former judge, as you are, Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe in not only punishing people who commit crimes, but also helping victims rebuild their lives. As a father of 4, grandfather of 11, I call upon all other fathers in the United States to refuse to sit back while America's children are being sold in the marketplace of sex. We have a responsibility, not just as Members of the House or the Senate, but as fathers, to fight this scourge that is taking place in our country.

That is why, in the Senate, Senator CORNYN and, in the House, CAROLYN MALONEY and I authored the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act: to provide law enforcement with new tools to apprehend those who commit these crimes and to provide resources for restoration for the survivors.

It is very encouraging that the House of Representatives and the United States Senate recently passed the Victims of Trafficking Act. It passed the Senate 99-0. It passed the House overwhelmingly, with only three voting against it. That very seldom happens in my experience in Congress, where one piece of legislation is so overwhelmingly supported by both sides of the aisle and in both the Senate and the House. This bipartisan bill has been signed into law by the President now.

Under this legislation, a special fund will be created to help these victims like Amanda get the shelter and services they need and provide them a fresh start. The law also ensures those who have been sold into slavery are treated as victims and not treated as criminals. Moreover, the legislation will strengthen law enforcement to give them tools to take down all human traffickers and organized criminal networks supporting them. Finally, the law targets the buyers, those predators who purchase children in the marketplace. The days of boys being boys in this country are going to end, and the law and law enforcement and the long arm of the law will go after these buyers. Partnerships on the Federal, State, and local level will be instrumental in stopping these crimes and rescuing victims.

So we must do everything possible to support survivors like Amanda—to break the cycle of sexual exploitation—overcome the pain of their experiences and help them to start a new life. We can achieve this if organizations like New Friends New Life and facilities like the Letot Center have the tools and resources they need to serve every victim. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act will help do this.

America must send the word that our children are not for sale, not in our town and not in our country.

And that is just the way it is.

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 56 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this House for the leadership of our Nation.

May all the Members have the vision of our Nation where respect and understanding are the marks of civility, and honor and integrity are the marks of one's character.

Give them the grace to see the best in those with whom they find disagreement and the courage to move together with them toward solutions that best serve our great Nation.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Ms. HAHN)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S LEGACY

(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, earlier this week, President Obama admitted that he does not have a complete strategy to fight ISIL, which he belittled as junior varsity, putting American families at risk. The President should change course to prevent more failed foreign policies.

Under his watch, the victory he cited in Iraq has evolved into the beheading of Americans and mass murder of Muslims by ISIL/Daesh. Safe havens exist to murder Americans worldwide.

Under his watch, Syria crossed his red line when it used chemical weapons to kill opposition yet faced no consequences. Iran continues with nuclear weapons development, building intercontinental ballistic missiles to achieve their goal of death to Israel, death to America.

Under his watch, Putin's regime invaded Ukraine, leaving over 7,000 dead, and extremists threaten American allies from the Baltics to central and southeastern Europe.

Under his watch, murder and kidnappings have swept Libya, Nigeria, Yemen, and Kenya, which the President should address with peace through strength.

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

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND DEADLINE

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind Republican colleagues it is time to get serious about our country's transportation needs. With another highway and transit trust fund deadline on the horizon, we can no longer keep our Nation stuck with small, short-term funding that fails to meet the challenges of our Nation's crumbling roads and bridges.

In the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex, a long-term, bipartisan fix will ensure that the Texas Department of Transportation, TxDOT, can continue its work on long-term projects like the horseshoe project near downtown Dal-

las and the expansion of I-35W in Fort Worth.

In addition, it would ensure that thousands of residents in north Texas can continue to utilize reliable public transit services like the T and DART.

Later this summer, the highway transit fund will expire in the middle of a very busy travel season while constituents like these are trying to come to Washington, D.C. It is time for the Republicans to put aside their rhetoric and make good on their word to the American people.

Don't keep folks stuck in traffic this summer. Let's pass a long-term highway bill.

CONGRATULATING WAYZATA'S TOP FINANCE STUDENTS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate two Wayzata High School students for doing so well in the National Securities Industry and Financial Market Association Foundation's student essay competition. Tyler Carlstrom, a sophomore, placed second in the InvestWrite essay competition, and senior Megan Plummer placed fifth.

The InvestWrite essay competition is a component of the stock market game that asks students around the country to analyze an investment scenario in 1,000 words or fewer. Tyler and Megan both used their analytical skills that they learned in their investments class at Wayzata High School, taught by their teacher, Candy Lee.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Financial and Economic Literacy Caucus, I believe our youth need more opportunities to learn how to effectively manage money in order to plan and achieve their financial goals. Events like this certainly strongly encourage our students to learn the ins and outs of our financial and economic world views.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Tyler and Megan on their great opportunity and doing so well in this tough competition.

FAST TRACK

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my opposition to the fast-track legislation making its way through our House this week.

Let me be clear, I am pro-trade. I represent the Port of Los Angeles, and I understand the potential benefits of a good trade deal. But I am also pro-worker, pro-environment, pro-immigration reform, pro-human rights and pro-food safety.

These goals, I believe, would be undermined by this fast-track legislation that limits our President's ability to negotiate those critical issues. More-

over, if the President gets fast-track authority, then our only role as Members of Congress would be an up-or-down vote on the final deal, limited debate, no amendments.

We cannot afford another bad trade deal. NAFTA cost our Nation over 800,000 manufacturing jobs.

I do not want to vote against a trade deal. I want to shape a fair deal that does not hurt American workers. I want a deal I can vote for.

MAGNA CARTA: PRESERVING THE LEGACY OF FREEDOM

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 800th anniversary of one of the world's most important documents, the Magna Carta.

On June 15, 1215, King John added his seal to the Magna Carta after it was drafted by barons in England who were tired of continued attacks on their freedoms and rights by a tyrannical king.

The Magna Carta, which is Latin for "the great charter," established the rule of law in England and served as an inspiration for the American revolution and the basis for the Declaration of Independence and our Bill of Rights.

As Thomas Paine said in 1776: "In free countries, the law ought to be king; and there ought to be no other."

Mr. Speaker, it seems that far too often our problem is we don't fully understand our history, and that is why we stray from it.

We are currently dealing with a President who has shown a willingness to change the laws through executive fiat. I believe it is vitally important that we remember the Magna Carta, which is based on the idea that no person, regardless of their position, will ever be above the law.

People from all over the world have fought for centuries in order to preserve and defend this basic principle, and that fight can never end. So on this 800th anniversary, I call on this body to remember the Magna Carta and work every day to carry forward the torch of freedom.

HELPING CONSUMERS ACHIEVE CAR OWNERSHIP

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of cutting the bureaucratic red tape strangling our Nation's small businesses.

In 2013, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau implemented guidance that would prevent families and individuals from obtaining auto financing discounts. The CFPB issued this guidance without a public comment period for consumers, small businesses, or stakeholders.

This guidance not only affects the American auto industry and the hundreds of hard-working auto dealers in the Granite State; but it also affects Granite State families and individuals, for example, the young couple in Manchester struggling to afford a new minivan to accommodate their growing family or the startup logistics company in Conway wishing to add another truck to their fleet to grow their business.

The detrimental aspects of this onerous regulation are felt throughout our State and our Nation. That is why I introduced H.R. 1737, a bipartisan bill to rein in the CFPB's overreach and merely bring more transparency, accountability, and clarity to the formal rule-making process. It will reverse the CFPB's indirect auto financing guidance and allow the public's voice to be heard.

This bill has 49 Republican cosponsors and 40 Democrat cosponsors. I look forward to working with all those interested in continuing to reverse this rule.

TWO BROTHERS, ONE JOURNEY

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary 15-year-old named Hunter Gandee from Monroe County, Michigan.

Hunter's 8-year-old brother, Braden, has cerebral palsy and cannot walk on his own. Last week, Hunter carried Braden on his back for 57 miles to raise awareness for the disease. The 3-day journey took the Gandee family from Lambertville to the University of Michigan's Pediatric Rehabilitation Center in Ann Arbor, where Braden has upcoming surgery.

Along the way, there were hugs, cheers, and outpouring of support from communities across Michigan and the country. Two brothers, one journey, an inspiring story of love, courage, and sacrifice—may we all learn from their example and do our part to make the world a better place.

God bless Hunter. God bless Braden.

THANKING EDIE LOWRY FOR HER SERVICE TO VETERANS

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my constituent and friend Edie Lowry for her service to our Nation's veterans as the founder and president of Honor Flight of Northeast Tennessee. Under Edie's direction, Honor Flight of Northeast Tennessee honors veterans by arranging trips and transporting former servicemen and -women to Washington, D.C., to visit their respective war memorials, all at no cost to the veterans.

Edie Lowry first became involved with the Honor Flight program in St.

Joseph, Missouri, after reading about the program in a newspaper article. During an honor flight in 2008, she witnessed firsthand the impact the Honor Flight program has on veterans' lives.

After discovering in 2010 that Honor Flight did not exist in our area, Edie established a chapter in northeast Tennessee. Honor Flight of Northeast Tennessee has helped dozens of veterans visit their memorial and receive the honor and recognition they deserve.

I thank Edie Lowry, my friend, for her service to veterans in our community through Honor Flight of Northeast Tennessee.

RECOGNIZING JARED DER-YEGHIAIAN

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great achievement of a 10th District hero, Jared Der-Yeghiayan.

Working with the FBI and the DEA, Special Agent Der-Yeghiayan served as the lead special agent from the Department of Homeland Security to shut down the notorious black market Web site Silk Road.

For more than 2 years, Special Agent Der-Yeghiayan worked undercover to infiltrate the Silk Road network, an underground Web site used by thousands of drug dealers and criminals to facilitate drug sales and illegal activity around the globe.

His innovative cyber investigation led to thousands of drug seizures, dozens of arrests, and the successful conviction of the owner and operator of the Silk Road Web site. In helping bring down this dark Web site, Jared Der-Yeghiayan has left his mark in making this country a safer and more secure place.

I am honored to have Jared as a constituent of Illinois' 10th District; I thank him for his service to this Nation, and I look forward to many more bright achievements in the future.

□ 1215

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this year's fiscal 2016 Defense Appropriations bill.

As we rapidly approach the final vote on this year's bill, I want to recognize the outstanding work that the Appropriations Committee has done in crafting this year's bill.

I am proud to represent the First Congressional District of Georgia, which is the proud home of Kings Bay Naval Submarine Base, Hunter Army Airfield, Moody Air Force Base, and Fort Stewart. These installations are the foundation of many critical mis-

sions that continue to support our troops abroad and our American citizens at home.

I am pleased and grateful that this year's appropriations bill supports the First District's important missions, and I commend the committee for its accomplishments, all while operating under budget.

Through this bill, the Georgia First's military installations and their personnel will continue receiving funding for critical missions that will ensure future success for our servicemen and -women. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING EDWARD JOSEPH OLENDER

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

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Army Sergeant Major Ed Olander, who passed away earlier this year at the age of 91.

For those who knew Ed, he was a humble and dedicated family man, neighbor, and friend. He was well-known around Tillson, New York, in having given his work in the post office, in his extensive volunteer service, in his service as a firefighter, and as a life member of the American Legion and the VFW. However, without knowing him well, you would never guess the rest of his life story.

Born in Dickinson, New York, in 1923, Ed joined the Army at the age of 17. He served in combat in the Pacific in World War II, including earning a Bronze Star for his actions in defending Hawaii during the attack on Pearl Harbor and earning a Purple Heart in Luzon. He also served in combat in both Korea and Vietnam, earning a second Purple Heart and various other awards and commendations. He retired in 1974 as a command sergeant major. He earned the Silver Star and also earned the Combat Infantryman Badge three times.

Ed was predeceased by his wife of 53 years, June, and they had three children, two grandchildren, and three stepgrandchildren.

I rise today to commemorate this great American hero—a humble but incredible example for all of us. May God bless Sergeant Major Olander and his entire family.

BRING OUR AMERICAN HEROES HOME

(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, yesterday, I teamed up with Congressman GERRY CONNOLLY of Virginia to introduce a resolution to ensure that future trade partners with the United States are active in the recovery efforts of our POWs and MIAs.

Mr. Speaker, as the father of an injured Army soldier, I thank God every day that my son returned home safely, and it pains me to know that there are still brave men and women who have not been recovered. This bipartisan resolution makes it clear that we as Americans take the promises we make to our servicemembers and their families very seriously, and we are hopeful that future trade partners will become partners in our ongoing recovery efforts.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Defense, more than 80,000 American citizens who served in the Vietnam war, the Korean war, and World War II are still missing in action, and I will not rest until all of our men and women are returned home. These American heroes deserve no less.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H. Res. 56.

PERMISSION TO MODIFY ORDER OF HOUSE OF JUNE 10, 2015, REGARDING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1295, IRS BUREAUCRACY REDUCTION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of June 10, 2015, regarding consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 1295, be modified by striking "printed" and inserting "submitted for printing."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) kindly take the chair.

□ 1219

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. CURBELO of Florida (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 162, line 25.

The Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016".

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) having assumed the chair, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

IRS BUREAUCRACY REDUCTION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of June 10, 2015, as modified by the order of the House of today, I call up the bill (H.R. 1295) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code, with the Senate amendments thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Findings.

Sec. 103. Extension of African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Sec. 104. Modifications of rules of origin for duty-free treatment for articles of beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 105. Monitoring and review of eligibility under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 106. Promotion of the role of women in social and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 107. Biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

Sec. 108. Deepening and expanding trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States.

Sec. 109. Agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 110. Reports.

Sec. 111. Technical amendments.

Sec. 112. Definitions.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Sec. 201. Extension of Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 202. Authority to designate certain cotton articles as eligible beneficiary developing countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 203. Application of competitive need limitation and waiver under Generalized System of Preferences with respect to articles of beneficiary developing countries exported to the United States during calendar year 2014.

Sec. 204. Travel goods.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

Sec. 301. Extension of preferential duty treatment program for Haiti.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

Sec. 401. Tariff classification of recreational performance outerwear.

Sec. 402. Duty treatment of specialized athletic footwear.

Sec. 403. Effective date.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Report on contribution of trade preference programs to reducing poverty and eliminating hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

Sec. 601. Customs user fees.

Sec. 602. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.

Sec. 603. Improved information reporting on unreported and underreported financial accounts.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015".

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since its enactment, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has been the centerpiece of trade relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and has enhanced trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

(2) Trade and investment, as facilitated by the African Growth and Opportunity Act, promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled since the enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act in 2000, and United States direct investment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown almost six-fold.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging markets in sub-Saharan African countries, to boost trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries, and to renew and strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(5) The long-term economic security of the United States is enhanced by strong economic and political ties with the fastest-growing economies in the world, many of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(6) It is a goal of the United States to further integrate sub-Saharan African countries into the global economy, stimulate economic development in Africa, and diversify sources of growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) To that end, implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization would strengthen regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and contribute to economic growth in the region.

(8) The elimination of barriers to trade and investment in sub-Saharan Africa, including high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, will create opportunities for workers, businesses, farmers, and ranchers in the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(9) The elimination of such barriers will improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and strengthen regional and global integration, accelerate economic growth in

sub-Saharan Africa, and enhance the trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466b) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(b) AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(g) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(g)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(2) EXTENSION OF REGIONAL APPAREL ARTICLE PROGRAM.—Section 112(b)(3)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “11 succeeding” and inserting “21 succeeding”; and

(B) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(3) EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “SEPTEMBER 30, 2015” and inserting “SEPTEMBER 30, 2025”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATIONS OF RULES OF ORIGIN FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506A(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: “(C) the direct costs of processing operations performed in one or more such beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries or former beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be applied in determining such percentage.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES RECEIVING DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER TITLE V OF TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 506A(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) RULES OF ORIGIN UNDER THIS TITLE.—The exceptions set forth in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) shall also apply to any article described in section 503(a)(1) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of any determination to provide duty-free treatment with respect to such article.”.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.—The President may proclaim such modifications as may be necessary to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to add the special tariff treatment symbol “D” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS for each article classified under a heading or subheading with the special tariff treatment symbol “A” or “A*” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any article described in section 503(b)(1)(B) through (G) of the Trade Act of 1974 that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and that is imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date that is 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—Section 506A(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “If the President” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under subparagraph (A) unless, at least 60 days before the termination of such designation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s intention to terminate such designation, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”.

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment provided for any article described in subsection (b)(1) of this section or section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that withdrawing, suspending, or limiting such duty-free treatment would be more effective in promoting compliance by the country with the requirements described in subsection (a)(1) than terminating the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of this section.

“(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under paragraph (1) unless, at least 60 days before such withdrawal, suspension, or limitation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s intention to withdraw, suspend, or limit such duty-free treatment, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”.

(c) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a), as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2), the President shall publish annually in the Federal Register a notice of review and request for public comments on whether beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(2) PUBLIC HEARING.—The United States Trade Representative shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President publishes the notice of review and request for public comments under paragraph (1)—

“(A) hold a public hearing on such review and request for public comments; and

“(B) publish in the Federal Register, before such hearing is held, notice of—

“(i) the time and place of such hearing; and

“(ii) the time and place at which such public comments will be accepted.

“(3) PETITION PROCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this sub-

section, the President shall establish a process to allow any interested person, at any time, to file a petition with the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to the compliance of any country listed in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of such Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(B) USE OF PETITIONS.—The President shall take into account all petitions filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in making determinations of compliance under subsections (a)(3)(A) and (c) and in preparing any reports required by this title as such reports apply with respect to beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

“(4) OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, at any time, initiate an out-of-cycle review of whether a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is making continual progress in meeting the requirements described in paragraph (1). The President shall give due consideration to petitions received under paragraph (3) in determining whether to initiate an out-of-cycle review under this subparagraph.

“(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before initiating an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify and consult with Congress.

“(C) CONSEQUENCES OF REVIEW.—If, pursuant to an out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A), the President determines that a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country does not meet the requirements set forth in section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)), the President shall, subject to the requirements of subsections (a)(3)(B) and (c)(2), terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country.

“(D) REPORTS.—After each out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country, the President shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the review and any determination of the President to terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country under subparagraph (C).

“(E) INITIATION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Recognizing that concerns have been raised about the compliance with section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)) of some beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, the President shall initiate an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A) with respect to South Africa, the most developed of the beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, and other beneficiary countries as appropriate, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.”.

SEC. 106. PROMOTION OF THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 103 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3702) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) promoting the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.”.

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 104(a)(1)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “for men and women” after “rights”.

SEC. 107. BIENNIAL AGOA UTILIZATION STRATEGIES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries should develop utilization strategies on a biennial basis in order to more effectively and strategically utilize benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (in this section referred to as “AGOA utilization strategies”);

(2) United States trade capacity building agencies should work with, and provide appropriate resources to, such sub-Saharan African countries to assist in developing and implementing biennial AGOA utilization strategies; and

(3) as appropriate, and to encourage greater regional integration, the United States Trade Representative should consider requesting the Regional Economic Communities to prepare biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

(b) *CONTENTS.*—It is further the sense of Congress that biennial AGOA utilization strategies should identify strategic needs and priorities to bolster utilization of benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. To that end, biennial AGOA utilization strategies should—

(1) review potential exports under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and identify opportunities and obstacles to increased trade and investment and enhanced poverty reduction efforts;

(2) identify obstacles to regional integration that inhibit utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act;

(3) set out a plan to take advantage of opportunities and address obstacles identified in paragraphs (1) and (2), improve awareness of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a program that enhances exports to the United States, and utilize United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs;

(4) set out a strategy to promote small business and entrepreneurship; and

(5) eliminate obstacles to regional trade and promote greater utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and establish a plan to promote full regional implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization.

(c) *PUBLICATION.*—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) each beneficiary sub-Saharan African country should publish on an appropriate Internet website of such country public versions of its AGOA utilization strategy; and

(2) the United States Trade Representative should publish on the Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative public versions of all AGOA utilization strategies described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 108. DEEPENING AND EXPANDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT TIES BETWEEN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to continue to—

(1) seek to deepen and expand trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States, including through the negotiation of accession by sub-Saharan African countries to the World Trade Organization and the negotiation of trade and investment framework agreements, bilateral investment treaties, and free trade agreements, as such agreements have the potential to catalyze greater trade and investment, facilitate additional investment in sub-Saharan Africa, further poverty reduction efforts, and promote economic growth;

(2) seek to negotiate agreements with individual sub-Saharan African countries as well as with the Regional Economic Communities, as appropriate;

(3) promote full implementation of commitments made under the WTO Agreement (as such term is defined in section 2(9) of the Uruguay

Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)) because such actions are likely to improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and promote trade and investment and because regular review to ensure continued compliance helps to maximize the benefits of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(4) promote the negotiation of trade agreements that cover substantially all trade between parties to such agreements and, if other countries seek to negotiate trade agreements that do not cover substantially all trade, continue to object in all appropriate forums.

SEC. 109. AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 13 of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (19 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “shall identify not fewer than 10 eligible sub-Saharan African countries as having the greatest” and inserting “, through the Secretary of Agriculture, shall identify eligible sub-Saharan African countries that have”; and

(B) by striking “and complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States” and inserting “, complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States, and developing food safety standards”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “20” and inserting “30”; and

(B) by inserting after “from those countries” the following: “, particularly from businesses and sectors that engage women farmers and entrepreneurs,”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) *COORDINATION.*—The President shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure adequate coordination of similar activities of agencies of the United States Government relating to agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.”.

SEC. 110. REPORTS.

(a) *IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries and on the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) *MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.*—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the status of trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, including information on leading exports to the United States from sub-Saharan African countries.

(B) Any changes in eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries during the period covered by the report.

(C) A detailed analysis of whether each such beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is continuing to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(D) A description of the status of regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.

(E) A summary of United States trade capacity building efforts.

(F) Any other initiatives related to enhancing the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(b) *POTENTIAL TRADE AGREEMENTS REPORT.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies sub-Saharan African countries that have expressed an interest in entering into a free trade agreement with the United States;

(2) evaluates the viability and progress of such sub-Saharan African countries and other

sub-Saharan African countries toward entering into a free trade agreement with the United States; and

(3) describes a plan for negotiating and concluding such agreements, which includes the elements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 116(b)(2) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(c) *TERMINATION.*—The reporting requirements of this section shall cease to have any force or effect after September 30, 2025.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703), as amended by section 106, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) *IN GENERAL.*”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) *BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.*—The term “beneficiary sub-Saharan African country” means a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in subsection (e) of section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (as redesignated by this Act).

(2) *SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.*—The term “sub-Saharan African country” has the meaning given the term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES**SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking “July 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2017”.

(b) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) *RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) would have applied if the entry had been made on July 31, 2013, that was made—

(i) after July 31, 2013, and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1),

shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) *REQUESTS.*—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) *PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.*—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this subsection:

(A) *COVERED ARTICLE.*—The term “covered article” means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) *ENTER; ENTRY.*—The terms “enter” and “entry” include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES AS ELIGIBLE ARTICLES ONLY FOR LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the President may designate as an eligible article or articles under subsection (a)(1)(B) only for countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries under section 502(a)(2) cotton articles classifiable under subheading 5201.00.18, 5201.00.28, 5201.00.38, 5202.99.30, or 5203.00.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.”.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVER UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 2014.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying and administering subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) with respect to an article described in subsection (b) of this section, subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of such Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “October 1” for “July 1” each place such date appears.

(b) ARTICLE DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is an article of a beneficiary developing country that is designated by the President as an eligible article under subsection (a) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) and with respect to which a determination described in subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section was made with respect to exports (directly or indirectly) to the United States of such eligible article during calendar year 2014 by the beneficiary developing country.

SEC. 204. TRAVEL GOODS.

Section 503(b)(1)(E) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)(E)) is amended by striking “handbags, luggage, flat goods,”.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI.

Section 213A of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(v)(I), by amending item (cc) to read as follows:

“(cc) 60 percent or more during the 1-year period beginning on December 20, 2017, and each of the 7 succeeding 1-year periods.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the table, by striking “succeeding 11 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(II) by striking “December 19, 2018” and inserting “December 19, 2025”.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”.

(2) Subsection (h) is amended by striking “September 30, 2020” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

SEC. 401. TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO ADDITIONAL U.S. NOTES.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter

62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended—

(1) in Additional U.S. Note 2—

(A) by striking “For the purposes of subheadings” and all that follows through “6211.20.15” and inserting “For purposes of this chapter”;

(B) by striking “garments classifiable in those subheadings” and inserting “a garment”; and

(C) by striking “D 3600-81” and inserting “D 3779-81”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new notes:

“3. (a) For purposes of this chapter, the term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ means trousers (including, but not limited to, paddling pants, ski or snowboard pants, and ski or snowboard pants intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), coveralls and bib overalls, and jackets (including, but not limited to, full zip jackets, paddling jackets, ski jackets, and ski jackets intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets) composed of fabrics of cotton, wool, hemp, bamboo, silk, or manmade fiber, or a combination of such fibers, that are either water resistant or treated with plastics, or both, with critically sealed seams, and with 5 or more of the following features:

“(i) Insulation for cold weather protection.

“(ii) Pockets, at least one of which has a zippered, hook and loop, or other type of closure.

“(iii) Elastic, drawcord, or other means of tightening around the waist or leg hems, including hidden leg sleeves with a means of tightening at the ankle for trousers and tightening around the waist or bottom hem for jackets.

“(iv) Venting, not including grommet(s).

“(v) Articulated elbows or knees.

“(vi) Reinforcement in one of the following areas: the elbows, shoulders, seat, knees, ankles, or cuffs.

“(vii) Weatherproof closure at the waist or front.

“(viii) Multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar.

“(ix) Adjustable powder skirt, inner protective skirt, or adjustable inner protective cuff at sleeve hem.

“(x) Construction at the arm gusset that utilizes fabric, design, or patterning to allow radial arm movement.

“(xi) Odor control technology.

The term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ does not include occupational outerwear.

“(b) For purposes of this Note, the following terms have the following meanings:

“(i) The term ‘treated with plastics’ refers to textile fabrics impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated with plastics, as described in Note 2 to chapter 59.

“(ii) The term ‘sealed seams’ means seams that have been covered by means of taping, gluing, bonding, cementing, fusing, welding, or a similar process so that water cannot pass through the seams when tested in accordance with the current version of AATCC Test Method 35.

“(iii) The term ‘critically sealed seams’ means—

“(A) for jackets, windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets), sealed seams that are sealed at the front and back yokes, or at the shoulders, arm holes, or both, where applicable; and

“(B) for trousers, overalls and bib overalls and similar articles, sealed seams that are sealed at the front (up to the zipper or other means of closure) and back rise.

“(iv) The term ‘insulation for cold weather protection’ means insulation with either synthetic fill, down, a laminated thermal backing, or other lining for thermal protection from cold weather.

“(v) The term ‘venting’ refers to closeable or permanent constructed openings in a garment (excluding front, primary zipper closures and

grommet(s)) to allow increased expulsion of built-up heat during outdoor activities. In a jacket, such openings are often positioned on the underarm seam of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment. In trousers, such openings are often positioned on the inner or outer leg seams of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment.

“(vi) The term ‘articulated elbows or knees’ refers to the construction of a sleeve (or pant leg) to allow improved mobility at the elbow (or knee) through the use of extra seams, darts, gussets, or other means.

“(vii) The term ‘reinforcement’ refers to the use of a double layer of fabric or section(s) of fabric that is abrasion-resistant or otherwise more durable than the face fabric of the garment.

“(viii) The term ‘weatherproof closure’ means a closure (including, but not limited to, laminated or coated zippers, storm flaps, or other weatherproof construction) that has been reinforced or engineered in a manner to reduce the penetration or absorption of moisture or air through an opening in the garment.

“(ix) The term ‘multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar’ means, in the case of a hood, a hood into which is incorporated two or more draw cords, adjustment tabs, or elastics, or, in the case of a collar, a collar into which is incorporated at least one draw cord, adjustment tab, elastic, or similar component, to allow volume adjustments around a helmet, or the crown of the head, neck, or face.

“(x) The terms ‘adjustable powder skirt’ and ‘inner protective skirt’ refer to a partial lower inner lining with means of tightening around the waist for additional protection from the elements.

“(xi) The term ‘arm gusset’ means construction at the arm of a gusset that utilizes an extra fabric piece in the underarm, usually diamond- or triangular-shaped, designed, or patterned to allow radial arm movement.

“(xii) The term ‘radial arm movement’ refers to unrestricted, 180-degree range of motion for the arm while wearing performance outerwear.

“(xiii) The term ‘odor control technology’ means the incorporation into a fabric or garment of materials, including, but not limited to, activated carbon, silver, copper, or any combination thereof, capable of adsorbing, absorbing, or reacting with human odors, or effective in reducing the growth of odor-causing bacteria.

“(xiv) The term ‘occupational outerwear’ means outerwear garments, including uniforms, designed or marketed for use in the workplace or at a worksite to provide durable protection from cold or inclement weather and/or workplace hazards, such as fire, electrical, abrasion, or chemical hazards, or impacts, cuts, punctures, or similar hazards.

“(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b)(i) of this Note, for purposes of this chapter, Notes 1 and 2(a)(1) to chapter 59 and Note 1(c) to chapter 60 shall be disregarded in classifying goods as ‘recreational performance outerwear’.

“(d) For purposes of this chapter, the importer of record shall maintain internal import records that specify upon entry whether garments claimed as recreational performance outerwear have an outer surface that is water resistant, treated with plastics, or a combination thereof, and shall further enumerate the specific features that make the garments eligible to be classified as recreational performance outerwear.”.

(b) TARIFF CLASSIFICATIONS.—Chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking subheading 6201.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:			
6201.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%
6201.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%

(2) By striking subheadings 6201.12.10 and 6201.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	60%
6201.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6201.12.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(3) By striking subheadings 6201.13.10 through 6201.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6201.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6201.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%

6201.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.
------------	-------------	-------	--	-----	----

(4) By striking subheadings 6201.19.10 and 6201.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.
Other:					
6201.19.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6201.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(5) By striking subheadings 6201.91.10 and 6201.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	58.5%
<i>Other:</i>				
6201.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU) 3.4% (OM)	58.5%
<i>Other:</i>				
6201.91.20	Other	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%

(6) By striking subheadings 6201.92.10 through 6201.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
<i>Other:</i>				
6201.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
<i>Other:</i>				
6201.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%
<i>Other:</i>				
6201.92.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(7) By striking subheadings 6201.93.10 through 6201.93.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
<i>Other:</i>				

6201.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6201.93.20	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6201.93.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.5¢/kg + 19.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%
6201.93.30	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%
6201.93.35	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(8) By striking subheadings 6201.99.10 and 6201.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%
6201.99.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%
6201.99.90	Other	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%

(9) By striking subheading 6202.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:			
6202.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%
6202.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%

(10) By striking subheadings 6202.12.10 and 6202.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6202.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6202.12.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(11) By striking subheadings 6202.13.10 through 6202.13.40 and inserting the following, as the article description for subheading 6202.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6202.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6202.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.5¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%

6202.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.
------------	-------------	-------	--	-----	----

(12) By striking subheadings 6202.19.10 and 6202.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
Other:					
6202.19.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight or silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6202.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(13) By striking subheadings 6202.91.10 and 6202.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	58.5%
6202.91.10	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	14%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 5.6% (OM)	58.5%
6202.91.20	Other	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%

(14) By striking subheadings 6202.92.10 through 6202.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6202.92.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6202.92.15	Other: Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%
6202.92.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(15) By striking subheadings 6202.93.10 through 6202.93.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
	Other:			

6202.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6202.93.20	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6202.93.40	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.4¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%
6202.93.45	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%
6202.93.50	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(16) By striking subheadings 6202.99.10 and 6202.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
<i>Other:</i>				
6202.99.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%
6202.99.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%

(17) By striking subheadings 6203.41 and 6203.41.05, and the superior text to subheading 6203.41.05, and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.41 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.41 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.41	Of wool or fine animal hair:			
6203.41.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41.9¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%
<i>Trousers, breeches and shorts:</i>				
6203.41.10	Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 9 kg per dozen	7.6%	8% (AU) 16.7¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	
<i>Trousers, breeches and shorts:</i>				
			Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	3% (OM) 52.9¢/kg + 58.5%

(18) By striking subheadings 6203.42.10 through 6203.42.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.42.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.42.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%
<i>Other:</i>				
6203.42.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free	8% (AU)	60%
<i>Other:</i>				
6203.42.20	Bib and brace overalls	10.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%
<i>Other:</i>				
6203.42.40	Other	16.6%	8% (AU)	11.6% (KR)
<i>Other:</i>				
			Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	8% (AU) 11.6% (KR) 90%

(19) By striking subheadings 6203.43.10 through 6203.43.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.43.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.43.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%
6203.43.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%
6203.43.15	Other: Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%
6203.43.20	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6203.43.25	Other: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6203.43.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.6¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%
6203.43.35	Other: Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU) 2.8% (KR)	65%
6203.43.40	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%

(20) By striking subheadings 6203.49 through 6203.49.80 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.49 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.49 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.49	Of other textile materials:			
6203.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%
	Other: Of artificial fibers:			

6203.49.10	Bib and brace overalls	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU)	76%
	<i>Trousers, breeches and shorts:</i>			
6203.49.15	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6203.49.20	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6203.49.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%
6203.49.80	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%

(21) By striking subheadings 6204.61.10 and 6204.61.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.61.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.61.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.61.05	Recreational performance outerwear	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%
6204.61.10	Other: Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 6 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 3% (OM) 6.8% (AU)	58.5%
6204.61.90	Other	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%

(22) By striking subheadings 6204.62.10 through 6204.62.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.62.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.62.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%
6204.62.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%
6204.62.20	Other: Bib and brace overalls	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6204.62.30	Other: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	37.5%
6204.62.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%

(23) By striking subheadings 6204.63.10 through 6204.63.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.63.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.63.05	Recreational performance outerwear	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%
6204.63.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%
6204.63.12	Other: Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%
6204.63.15	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6204.63.20	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	11.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6204.63.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%
6204.63.30	Other: Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%
6204.63.35	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%

(24) By striking subheadings 6204.69 through 6204.69.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.69 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.69 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.69	Of other textile materials:			
6204.69.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
6204.69.10	Other: Of artificial fibers: Bib and brace overalls	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%

6204.69.20	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%
6204.69.25	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6204.69.40	Of silk or silk waste: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, J, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%
6204.69.60	Other	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%
6204.69.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%

(25) By striking subheadings 6210.40.30 and 6210.40.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.40.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.40.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6210.40.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%
6210.40.30	Other: Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%
6210.40.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%

(26) By striking subheadings 6210.50.30 and 6210.50.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.50.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.50.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6210.50.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%
6210.50.30	Other: Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%
6210.50.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%

(27) By striking subheading 6211.32.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.32.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.32	Of cotton:			
6211.32.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%
6211.32.10	Other	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%

(28) By striking subheading 6211.33.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.33 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.33.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.33	Of man-made fibers:			
6211.33.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%
6211.33.10	Other	16%	6.4% (OM) Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%

(29) By striking subheadings 6211.39.05 through 6211.39.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.39.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
6211.39.10	Other:			
	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	58.5%
6211.39.20	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	0.5%	4.8% (OM) Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
6211.39.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%

(30) By striking subheading 6211.42.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.42.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.42	Of cotton:			
6211.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%
			7.2% (AU)	

6211.42.10	Other	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.2% (AU)	90%	”.
------------	-------------	------	---	-----	----

(31) By striking subheading 6211.43.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.43 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.43.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.43	Of man-made fibers:				
6211.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	
6211.43.10	Other	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	”.

(32) By striking subheadings 6211.49.10 through 6211.49.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.49.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.49.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	
6211.49.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.2%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.49.41	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6211.49.90	Other	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	”.

SEC. 402. DUTY TREATMENT OF SPECIALIZED ATHLETIC FOOTWEAR.

(a) DEFINITION OF SPECIALIZED ATHLETIC FOOTWEAR.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended by adding at the end the following:

“6. For the purposes of this chapter, the term ‘specialized athletic footwear’ includes footwear

(other than footwear described in Subheading Note 1 or Additional U.S. Note 2) that is designed to be worn chiefly for sports or athletic purposes, hiking shoes, trekking shoes, and trail running shoes, the foregoing valued over \$24/pair and which provides protection against water that is imparted by the use of a coated or laminated textile fabric.”.

(b) DUTY TREATMENT FOR SPECIALIZED ATHLETIC FOOTWEAR.—Chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after subheading 6402.91.40 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.91.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.91.40:

" 6402.91.42	Specialized athletic footwear (except footwear with waterproof molded bottoms, including bottoms comprising an outer sole and all or part of the upper and except footwear with insulation that provides protection against cold weather), whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 15.34 cm	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, R, SG)	35%	".
--------------	--	-----	---	-----	----

(2) By inserting immediately preceding subheading 6402.99.33 the following new subheading 6402.99.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.99.33:

" 6402.99.32	Specialized athletic footwear	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, IL, JO, MA, MX, P) 1% (PA) 6% (OM) 6% (PE) 12% (CO) 20% (KR)	35%	".
--------------	-------------------------------------	-----	---	-----	----

(c) **STAGED RATE REDUCTIONS.**—The staged reductions in special rates of duty proclaimed for subheading 6402.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be applied to subheading 6402.99.32 of such Schedule, as added by subsection (b)(2), beginning in calendar year 2016.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall—

- (1) take effect on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and
- (2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 15th day.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. REPORT ON CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS TO REDUCING POVERTY AND ELIMINATING HUNGER.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the contribution of the trade preference programs of the United States, including the Generalized System of Preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.), the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

SEC. 601. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “July 7, 2025”.

(b) **RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.**—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking “June 30, 2021” and inserting “June 30, 2025”.

SEC. 602. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

- (1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 5.25 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and
- (2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in para-

graph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 603. IMPROVED INFORMATION REPORTING ON UNREPORTED AND UNDER-REPORTED FINANCIAL ACCOUNTS.

(a) **ELIMINATION OF MINIMUM INTEREST REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6049(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “aggregating \$10 or more” each place it appears.

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Subparagraph (C) of section 6049(d)(5) of such Code is amended—

- (A) by striking “which involves the payment of \$10 or more of interest”, and
- (B) by striking “IN THE CASE OF TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING \$10 OR MORE” in the heading.

(3) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns filed after December 31, 2015.

(b) **REPORTING OF NON-INTEREST BEARING DEPOSITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subpart B of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 6049 the following new section:

“SEC. 6049A. RETURNS REGARDING NON-INTEREST BEARING DEPOSITS.

“(a) **REQUIREMENT OF REPORTING.**—Every person who holds a reportable deposit during any calendar year shall make a return according to the forms or regulations prescribed by the Secretary, setting forth the name and address of the person for whom such deposit was held.

“(b) **REPORTABLE DEPOSIT.**—For purposes of this section—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘reportable deposit’ means—

- “(A) any amount on deposit with—
- “(i) a person carrying on a banking business,
- “(ii) a mutual savings bank, a savings and loan association, a building and loan association, a cooperative bank, a homestead association, a credit union, an industrial loan association or bank, or any similar organization,
- “(iii) a broker (as defined in section 6045(c)), or

“(iv) any other person provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary, or

“(B) to the extent provided by the Secretary in regulations, any amount held by an insurance company, an investment company (as defined in section 3 of the Investment Company Act of 1940), or held in other pooled funds or trusts.

“(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Such term shall not include—

“(A) any amount with respect to which a report is made under section 6049,

“(B) any amount on deposit with or held by a natural person,

“(C) except to the extent provided in regulations, any amount—

“(i) held with respect to a person described in section 6049(b)(4),

“(ii) with respect to which section 6049(b)(5) would apply if a payment were made with respect to such amount, or

“(iii) on deposit with or held by a person described in section 6049(b)(2)(C), or

“(D) any amount for which the Secretary determines there is already sufficient reporting.

“(c) **STATEMENTS TO BE FURNISHED TO PERSONS WITH RESPECT TO WHOM INFORMATION IS REQUIRED.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Every person required to make a return under subsection (a) shall furnish to each person whose name is required to be set forth in such return a written statement showing—

“(A) the name, address, and phone number of the information contact of the person required to make such return, and

“(B) the reportable account with respect to which such return was made.

“(2) **TIME AND FORM OF STATEMENT.**—The written statement under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be furnished at a time and in a manner similar to the time and manner that statements are required to be filed under section 6049(c)(2), and

“(B) shall be in such form as the Secretary may prescribe by regulations.

“(d) **PERSON.**—For purposes of this section, the term ‘person’, when referring to the person for whom a deposit is held, includes any governmental unit and any agency or instrumentality thereof and any international organization and any agency or instrumentality thereof.”.

(2) **ASSESSABLE PENALTIES.**—

(A) **FAILURE TO FILE RETURN.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 6724(d)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “or” at the end of clause (xxiv), by striking “and” at the end of clause (xxv) and inserting “or”, and by inserting after clause (xxv) the following new clause:

“(xxvi) section 6049A(a) (relating to returns regarding non-interest bearing deposits), and”.

(B) **FAILURE TO FILE PAYEE STATEMENT.**—Paragraph (2) of section 6724(d) of such Code is amended by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (GG), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (HH) and inserting “, or”, and by inserting after subparagraph (HH) the following new subparagraph:

“(II) section 6049A(c) (relating to returns regarding non-interest bearing deposits).”.

(3) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of section for subpart B of part III of subchapter A of

chapter 61 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 6049 the following new item:

“Sec. 6049A. Returns regarding non-interest bearing deposits.”.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns filed after December 31, 2015.

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.”.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

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

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the title of H.R. 1295 and concur in the Senate amendment to the text of H.R. 1295 with amendment No. 1 submitted for printing in the Congressional Record.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendments to the text is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Findings.

Sec. 103. Extension of African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Sec. 104. Modifications of rules of origin for duty-free treatment for articles of beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 105. Monitoring and review of eligibility under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 106. Promotion of the role of women in social and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 107. Biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

Sec. 108. Deepening and expanding trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States.

Sec. 109. Agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 110. Reports.

Sec. 111. Technical amendments.

Sec. 112. Definitions.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Sec. 201. Extension of Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 202. Authority to designate certain cotton articles as eligible articles only for least-developed beneficiary developing countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 203. Application of competitive need limitation and waiver under Generalized System of Preferences with respect to articles of beneficiary developing countries exported to the United States during calendar year 2014.

Sec. 204. Eligibility of certain luggage and travel articles for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

Sec. 301. Extension of preferential duty treatment program for Haiti.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

Sec. 401. Tariff classification of recreational performance outerwear.

Sec. 402. Duty treatment of protective active footwear.

Sec. 403. Effective date.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Report on contribution of trade preference programs to reducing poverty and eliminating hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

Sec. 601. Customs user fees.

Sec. 602. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.

Sec. 603. Elimination of modification of the Medicare sequester for fiscal year 2024.

Sec. 604. Payee statement required to claim certain education tax benefits.

Sec. 605. Special rule for educational institutions unable to collect TINs of individuals with respect to higher education tuition and related expenses.

Sec. 606. Penalty for failure to file correct information returns and provide payee statements.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since its enactment, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has been the centerpiece of trade relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and has enhanced trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

(2) Trade and investment, as facilitated by the African Growth and Opportunity Act, promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled since the enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act in 2000, and United States direct investment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown almost six-fold.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging markets in sub-Saharan African countries, to boost trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries, and to renew and strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(5) The long-term economic security of the United States is enhanced by strong economic and political ties with the fastest-growing economies in the world, many of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(6) It is a goal of the United States to further integrate sub-Saharan African countries into the global economy, stimulate economic development in Africa, and diversify sources of growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) To that end, implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization would strengthen regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and contribute to economic growth in the region.

(8) The elimination of barriers to trade and investment in sub-Saharan Africa, including high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, will create opportunities for workers, businesses, farmers, and ranchers in the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(9) The elimination of such barriers will improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and strengthen regional and global integration, accelerate economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, and enhance the trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466b) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(b) AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(g) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(g)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(2) EXTENSION OF REGIONAL APPAREL ARTICLE PROGRAM.—Section 112(b)(3)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “11 succeeding” and inserting “21 succeeding”; and

(B) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(3) EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “SEPTEMBER 30, 2015” and inserting “SEPTEMBER 30, 2025”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATIONS OF RULES OF ORIGIN FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506A(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the direct costs of processing operations performed in one or more such beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries or former beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be applied in determining such percentage.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES RECEIVING DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER TITLE V OF TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 506A(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) RULES OF ORIGIN UNDER THIS TITLE.—The exceptions set forth in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) shall also apply to any article described in section 503(a)(1) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of any determination to provide duty-free treatment with respect to such article.”.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.—The President may proclaim such modifications as may be necessary to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to add the special tariff

treatment symbol “D” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS for each article classified under a heading or subheading with the special tariff treatment symbol “A” or “A*” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any article described in section 503(b)(1)(B) through (G) of the Trade Act of 1974 that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and that is imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date that is 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—Section 506A(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “If the President” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under subparagraph (A) unless, at least 60 days before the termination of such designation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s intention to terminate such designation, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”.

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment provided for any article described in subsection (b)(1) of this section or section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that withdrawing, suspending, or limiting such duty-free treatment would be more effective in promoting compliance by the country with the requirements described in subsection (a)(1) than terminating the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of this section.

“(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under paragraph (1) unless, at least 60 days before such withdrawal, suspension, or limitation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s intention to withdraw, suspend, or limit such duty-free treatment, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”.

(c) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a), as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2), the President shall publish annually in the Federal Register a notice of review and request for public comments on whether beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are meeting the eligibility require-

ments set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(2) PUBLIC HEARING.—The United States Trade Representative shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President publishes the notice of review and request for public comments under paragraph (1)—

“(A) hold a public hearing on such review and request for public comments; and

“(B) publish in the Federal Register, before such hearing is held, notice of—

“(i) the time and place of such hearing; and

“(ii) the time and place at which such public comments will be accepted.

“(3) PETITION PROCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall establish a process to allow any interested person, at any time, to file a petition with the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to the compliance of any country listed in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of such Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(B) USE OF PETITIONS.—The President shall take into account all petitions filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in making determinations of compliance under subsections (a)(3)(A) and (c) and in preparing any reports required by this title as such reports apply with respect to beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

“(4) OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, at any time, initiate an out-of-cycle review of whether a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is making continual progress in meeting the requirements described in paragraph (1). The President shall give due consideration to petitions received under paragraph (3) in determining whether to initiate an out-of-cycle review under this subparagraph.

“(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before initiating an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify and consult with Congress.

“(C) CONSEQUENCES OF REVIEW.—If, pursuant to an out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A), the President determines that a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country does not meet the requirements set forth in section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)), the President shall, subject to the requirements of subsections (a)(3)(B) and (c)(2), terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country.

“(D) REPORTS.—After each out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country, the President shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the review and any determination of the President to terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country under subparagraph (C).

“(E) INITIATION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Recognizing that concerns have been raised about the compliance with section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)) of some beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, the President shall initiate an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A) with respect to South Africa, the most

developed of the beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, and other beneficiary countries as appropriate, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.”.

SEC. 106. PROMOTION OF THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 103 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3702) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) promoting the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.”.

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 104(a)(1)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “for men and women” after “rights”.

SEC. 107. BIENNIAL AGOA UTILIZATION STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries should develop utilization strategies on a biennial basis in order to more effectively and strategically utilize benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (in this section referred to as “AGOA utilization strategies”);

(2) United States trade capacity building agencies should work with, and provide appropriate resources to, such sub-Saharan African countries to assist in developing and implementing biennial AGOA utilization strategies; and

(3) as appropriate, and to encourage greater regional integration, the United States Trade Representative should consider requesting the Regional Economic Communities to prepare biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

(b) CONTENTS.—It is further the sense of Congress that biennial AGOA utilization strategies should identify strategic needs and priorities to bolster utilization of benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. To that end, biennial AGOA utilization strategies should—

(1) review potential exports under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and identify opportunities and obstacles to increased trade and investment and enhanced poverty reduction efforts;

(2) identify obstacles to regional integration that inhibit utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act;

(3) set out a plan to take advantage of opportunities and address obstacles identified in paragraphs (1) and (2), improve awareness of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a program that enhances exports to the United States, and utilize United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs;

(4) set out a strategy to promote small business and entrepreneurship; and

(5) eliminate obstacles to regional trade and promote greater utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and establish a plan to promote full regional implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization.

(c) PUBLICATION.—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) each beneficiary sub-Saharan African country should publish on an appropriate Internet website of such country public versions of its AGOA utilization strategy; and

(2) the United States Trade Representative should publish on the Internet website of the

Office of the United States Trade Representative public versions of all AGOA utilization strategies described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 108. DEEPENING AND EXPANDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT TIES BETWEEN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to continue to—

(1) seek to deepen and expand trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States, including through the negotiation of accession by sub-Saharan African countries to the World Trade Organization and the negotiation of trade and investment framework agreements, bilateral investment treaties, and free trade agreements, as such agreements have the potential to catalyze greater trade and investment, facilitate additional investment in sub-Saharan Africa, further poverty reduction efforts, and promote economic growth;

(2) seek to negotiate agreements with individual sub-Saharan African countries as well as with the Regional Economic Communities, as appropriate;

(3) promote full implementation of commitments made under the WTO Agreement (as such term is defined in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9)) because such actions are likely to improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and promote trade and investment and because regular review to ensure continued compliance helps to maximize the benefits of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(4) promote the negotiation of trade agreements that cover substantially all trade between parties to such agreements and, if other countries seek to negotiate trade agreements that do not cover substantially all trade, continue to object in all appropriate forums.

SEC. 109. AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 13 of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (19 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “shall identify not fewer than 10 eligible sub-Saharan African countries as having the greatest” and inserting “, through the Secretary of Agriculture, shall identify eligible sub-Saharan African countries that have”; and

(B) by striking “and complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States” and inserting “, complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States, and developing food safety standards”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “20” and inserting “30”; and

(B) by inserting after “from those countries” the following: “, particularly from businesses and sectors that engage women farmers and entrepreneurs.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **COORDINATION.**—The President shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure adequate coordination of similar activities of agencies of the United States Government relating to agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.”.

SEC. 110. REPORTS.

(a) **IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries and on the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the status of trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, including information on leading exports to the United States from sub-Saharan African countries.

(B) Any changes in eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries during the period covered by the report.

(C) A detailed analysis of whether each such beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is continuing to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(D) A description of the status of regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.

(E) A summary of United States trade capacity building efforts.

(F) Any other initiatives related to enhancing the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(b) **POTENTIAL TRADE AGREEMENTS REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies sub-Saharan African countries that have expressed an interest in entering into a free trade agreement with the United States;

(2) evaluates the viability and progress of such sub-Saharan African countries and other sub-Saharan African countries toward entering into a free trade agreement with the United States; and

(3) describes a plan for negotiating and concluding such agreements, which includes the elements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 116(b)(2) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(c) **TERMINATION.**—The reporting requirements of this section shall cease to have any force or effect after September 30, 2025.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703), as amended by section 106, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.**—The term “beneficiary sub-Saharan African country” means a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in subsection (e) of section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (as redesignated by this Act).

(2) **SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.**—The term “sub-Saharan African country” has the meaning given the term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking “July 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2017”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.)

would have applied if the entry had been made on July 31, 2013, that was made—

(i) after July 31, 2013, and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) **REQUESTS.**—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) **PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.**—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

(A) **COVERED ARTICLE.**—The term “covered article” means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) **ENTER; ENTRY.**—The terms “enter” and “entry” include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES AS ELIGIBLE ARTICLES ONLY FOR LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the President may designate as an eligible article or articles under subsection (a)(1)(B) only for countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries under section 502(a)(2) cotton articles classifiable under subheading 5201.00.18, 5201.00.28, 5201.00.38, 5202.99.30, or 5203.00.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.”.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVER UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 2014.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of applying and administering subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) with respect to an article described in subsection (b) of this section, subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of such Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “October 1” for “July 1” each place such date appears.

(b) **ARTICLE DESCRIBED.**—An article described in this subsection is an article of a beneficiary developing country that is designated by the President as an eligible article under subsection (a) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) and with respect to which a determination described in subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section was made with respect to exports (directly or indirectly) to the United States of such eligible article during calendar year 2014 by the beneficiary developing country.

SEC. 204. ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (5)”;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking “Footwear” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (5), footwear”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) or (E) of paragraph (1), the President may designate the following as eligible articles under subsection (a):

“(A) Articles classifiable under subheading 4202.11.00, 4202.12.40, 4202.21.60, 4202.21.90, 4202.22.15, 4202.22.45, 4202.31.60, 4202.32.40, 4202.32.80, 4202.92.15, 4202.92.20, 4202.92.45, or 4202.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

“(B) Articles classifiable under statistical reporting number 4202.12.2020, 4202.12.2050, 4202.12.8030, 4202.12.8070, 4202.22.8050, 4202.32.9550, 4202.32.9560, 4202.91.0030, 4202.91.0090, 4202.92.3020, 4202.92.3031, 4202.92.3091, 4202.92.9026, or 4202.92.9060 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, as such statistical reporting numbers are in effect on the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.”.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI
SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI.

Section 213A of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(v)(I), by amending item (c) to read as follows:

“(cc) 60 percent or more during the 1-year period beginning on December 20, 2017, and each of the 7 succeeding 1-year periods.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the table, by striking “succeeding 11 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”;

(II) by striking “December 19, 2018” and inserting “December 19, 2025”.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”.

(2) Subsection (h) is amended by striking “September 30, 2020” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

TITLE IV—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

SEC. 401. TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO ADDITIONAL U.S. NOTES.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended—

(1) in Additional U.S. Note 2—

(A) by striking “For the purposes of subheadings” and all that follows through “6211.20.15” and inserting “For purposes of this chapter”;

(B) by striking “garments classifiable in those subheadings” and inserting “a garment”;

(C) by striking “D 3600-81” and inserting “D 3779-81”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new notes:

“(3. (a) For purposes of this chapter, the term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ means trousers (including, but not limited to, paddling pants, ski or snowboard pants, and ski or snowboard pants intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), coveralls and bib overalls, and jackets (including, but not limited to, full zip jackets, paddling jackets, ski jackets, and ski jackets intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets) composed of fabrics of cotton, wool, hemp, bamboo, silk, or manmade fiber, or a combination of such fibers, that are either water resistant or treated with plastics, or both, with critically sealed seams, and with 5 or more of the following features:

“(i) Insulation for cold weather protection.

“(ii) Pockets, at least one of which has a zippered, hook and loop, or other type of closure.

“(iii) Elastic, drawcord, or other means of tightening around the waist or leg hems, including hidden leg sleeves with a means of tightening at the ankle for trousers and tightening around the waist or bottom hem for jackets.

“(iv) Venting, not including grommet(s).

“(v) Articulated elbows or knees.

“(vi) Reinforcement in one of the following areas: the elbows, shoulders, seat, knees, ankles, or cuffs.

“(vii) Weatherproof closure at the waist or front.

“(viii) Multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar.

“(ix) Adjustable powder skirt, inner protective skirt, or adjustable inner protective cuff at sleeve hem.

“(x) Construction at the arm gusset that utilizes fabric, design, or patterning to allow radial arm movement.

“(xi) Odor control technology.

The term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ does not include occupational outerwear.

“(b) For purposes of this Note, the following terms have the following meanings:

“(i) The term ‘treated with plastics’ refers to textile fabrics impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated with plastics, as described in Note 2 to chapter 59.

“(ii) The term ‘sealed seams’ means seams that have been covered by means of taping, gluing, bonding, cementing, fusing, welding, or a similar process so that water cannot pass through the seams when tested in accordance with the current version of AATCC Test Method 35.

“(iii) The term ‘critically sealed seams’ means—

“(A) for jackets, windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets), sealed seams that are sealed at the front and back yokes, or at the shoulders, arm holes, or both, where applicable; and

“(B) for trousers, overalls and bib overalls and similar articles, sealed seams that are sealed at the front (up to the zipper or other means of closure) and back rise.

“(iv) The term ‘insulation for cold weather protection’ means insulation with either synthetic fill, down, a laminated thermal backing, or other lining for thermal protection from cold weather.

“(v) The term ‘venting’ refers to closeable or permanent constructed openings in a garment (excluding front, primary zipper closures and grommet(s)) to allow increased expulsion of built-up heat during outdoor activities. In a jacket, such openings are often positioned on the underarm seam of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment. In trousers, such openings are often positioned on the inner or outer leg seams of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment.

“(vi) The term ‘articulated elbows or knees’ refers to the construction of a sleeve (or pant leg) to allow improved mobility at the elbow (or knee) through the use of extra seams, darts, gussets, or other means.

“(vii) The term ‘reinforcement’ refers to the use of a double layer of fabric or section(s) of fabric that is abrasion-resistant or otherwise more durable than the face fabric of the garment.

“(viii) The term ‘weatherproof closure’ means a closure (including, but not limited to, laminated or coated zippers, storm flaps, or other weatherproof construction) that has been reinforced or engineered in a manner to reduce the penetration or absorption of moisture or air through an opening in the garment.

“(ix) The term ‘multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar’ means, in the case of a hood, a hood into which is incorporated two or more draw cords, adjustment tabs, or elastics, or, in the case of a collar, a collar into which is incorporated at least one draw cord, adjustment tab, elastic, or similar component, to allow volume adjustments around a helmet, or the crown of the head, neck, or face.

“(x) The terms ‘adjustable powder skirt’ and ‘inner protective skirt’ refer to a partial lower inner lining with means of tightening around the waist for additional protection from the elements.

“(xi) The term ‘arm gusset’ means construction at the arm of a gusset that utilizes an extra fabric piece in the underarm, usually diamond- or triangular-shaped, designed, or patterned to allow radial arm movement.

“(xii) The term ‘radial arm movement’ refers to unrestricted, 180-degree range of motion for the arm while wearing performance outerwear.

“(xiii) The term ‘odor control technology’ means the incorporation into a fabric or garment of materials, including, but not limited to, activated carbon, silver, copper, or any combination thereof, capable of adsorbing, absorbing, or reacting with human odors, or effective in reducing the growth of odor-causing bacteria.

“(xiv) The term ‘occupational outerwear’ means outerwear garments, including uniforms, designed or marketed for use in the workplace or at a worksite to provide durable protection from cold or inclement weather and/or workplace hazards, such as fire, electrical, abrasion, or chemical hazards, or impacts, cuts, punctures, or similar hazards.

“(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b)(i) of this Note, for purposes of this chapter, Notes 1 and 2(a)(1) to chapter 59 and Note 1(c) to chapter 60 shall be disregarded in classifying goods as ‘recreational performance outerwear’.

“(d) For purposes of this chapter, the importer of record shall maintain internal import records that specify upon entry whether garments claimed as recreational performance outerwear have an outer surface that is water resistant, treated with plastics, or a combination thereof, and shall further enumerate the specific features that make the garments eligible to be classified as recreational performance outerwear.”.

(b) TARIFF CLASSIFICATIONS.—Chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking subheading 6201.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:			
6201.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%
6201.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%

(2) By striking subheadings 6201.12.10 and 6201.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	60%
6201.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6201.12.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(3) By striking subheadings 6201.13.10 through 6201.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6201.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6201.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%
6201.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(4) By striking subheadings 6201.19.10 and 6201.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
6201.19.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%

6201.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	"
------------	-------------	------	--	-----	---

(5) By striking subheadings 6201.91.10 and 6201.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	58.5%	"
6201.91.10	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU) 3.4% (OM)	58.5%	
6201.91.20	Other	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	

(6) By striking subheadings 6201.92.10 through 6201.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	"
6201.92.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6201.92.15	Other: Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
6201.92.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	

(7) By striking subheadings 6201.93.10 through 6201.93.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6201.93.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6201.93.20	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6201.93.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.5¢/kg + 19.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%
6201.93.30	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%
6201.93.35	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(8) By striking subheadings 6201.99.10 and 6201.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%
6201.99.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%
6201.99.90	Other	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%

(9) By striking subheading 6202.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:			
6202.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%
6202.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%

(10) By striking subheadings 6202.12.10 and 6202.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6202.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6202.12.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(11) By striking subheadings 6202.13.10 through 6202.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6202.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6202.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.5¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%
6202.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(12) By striking subheadings 6202.19.10 and 6202.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
6202.19.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight or silk or silk waste	Free	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
6202.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%

(13) By striking subheadings 6202.91.10 and 6202.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	58.5%
	Other:			

6202.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 5.6% (OM)	58.5%	
6202.91.20	Other	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	"

(14) By striking subheadings 6202.92.10 through 6202.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6202.92.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6202.92.15	Other: Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
6202.92.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	"

(15) By striking subheadings 6202.93.10 through 6202.93.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for heading 6202.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6202.93.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%
6202.93.20	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6202.93.40	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.4¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%
6202.93.45	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%
6202.93.50	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%

(16) By striking subheadings 6202.99.10 and 6202.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%
6202.99.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%
6202.99.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%

(17) By striking subheadings 6203.41 and 6203.41.05, and the superior text to subheading 6203.41.05, and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.41 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.41 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.41	Of wool or fine animal hair:			
6203.41.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41.9¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.7¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%
6203.41.10	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 9 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.8% (AU) 3% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%

(18) By striking subheadings 6203.42.10 through 6203.42.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6203.42.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.42.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%
6203.42.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%
6203.42.20	Other: Bib and brace overalls	10.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%
6203.42.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%

(19) By striking subheadings 6203.43.10 through 6203.43.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

6203.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%
6203.43.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%
6203.43.15	Other: Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%
6203.43.20	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6203.43.25	Other: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%
6203.43.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.6¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%
6203.43.35	Other: Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU) 2.8% (KR)	65%
6203.43.40	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%

(20) By striking subheadings 6203.49 through 6203.49.80 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

6203.49	Of other textile materials:				
6203.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	
	Other:				
	Of artificial fibers:				
6203.49.10	Bib and brace overalls	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU)	76%	
	Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
6203.49.15	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.49.20	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6203.49.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6203.49.80	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	”.

(21) By striking subheadings 6204.61.10 and 6204.61.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.61.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.61.05	Recreational performance outerwear	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	Other:				
6204.61.10	Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 6 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 3% (OM) 6.8% (AU)	58.5%	
6204.61.90	Other	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	”.

(22) By striking subheadings 6204.62.10 through 6204.62.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.62.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.62.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.62.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
	Other:				
6204.62.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
	Other:				
6204.62.20	Bib and brace overalls	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	Other:				

6204.62.30	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	37.5%	
6204.62.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	”.

(23) By striking subheadings 6204.63.10 through 6204.63.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.63.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.63.05	Recreational performance outerwear	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	
6204.63.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
6204.63.12	Other: Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6204.63.15	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6204.63.20	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	11.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6204.63.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6204.63.30	Other: Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6204.63.35	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	”.

(24) By striking subheadings 6204.69 through 6204.69.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.69 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6204.69	Of other textile materials:				
6204.69.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	Other:				
	Of artificial fibers:				
6204.69.10	Bib and brace overalls	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	Trousers, breeches and shorts:				
6204.69.20	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6204.69.25	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	Of silk or silk waste:				
6204.69.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, J, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%	
6204.69.60	Other	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6204.69.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(25) By striking subheadings 6210.40.30 and 6210.40.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.40.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.40.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6210.40.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	Other:				
6210.40.30	Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
6210.40.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	”.

(26) By striking subheadings 6210.50.30 and 6210.50.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6210.50.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6210.50.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6210.50.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	Other:				
6210.50.30	Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
6210.50.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	”.

(27) By striking subheading 6211.32.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.32.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.32	Of cotton:	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.
	6211.32.05	Recreational performance outerwear				
	6211.32.10	Other	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.

(28) By striking subheading 6211.33.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.33 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.33.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.33	Of man-made fibers:	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	”.
	6211.33.05	Recreational performance outerwear				
	6211.33.10	Other	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	”.

(29) By striking subheadings 6211.39.05 through 6211.39.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.39.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.
	6211.39.10	Other:	12%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	58.5%	
		Of wool or fine animal hair				
	6211.39.20	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	0.5%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6211.39.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(30) By striking subheading 6211.42.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.42.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.42	Of cotton:	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.
	6211.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear				
	6211.42.10	Other	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	”.

(31) By striking subheading 6211.43.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.43 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.43.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.43	Of man-made fibers:				
---	---------	---------------------	--	--	--	--

6211.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	
6211.43.10	Other	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	"

(32) By striking subheadings 6211.49.10 through 6211.49.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.49.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.49.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	
6211.49.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.2%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.49.41	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6211.49.90	Other	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	"

SEC. 402. DUTY TREATMENT OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.

(a) DEFINITION OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended by adding at the end the following:

“6. For the purposes of subheadings 6402.91.42 and 6402.99.32, the term ‘protective

active footwear’ means footwear (other than footwear described in Subheading Note 1) that is designed for outdoor activities, such as hiking shoes, trekking shoes, running shoes, and trail running shoes, the foregoing valued over \$24/pair and which provides protection against water that is imparted by the use of a coated or laminated textile fabric.”.

(b) DUTY TREATMENT FOR PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—Chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after subheading 6402.91.40 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.91.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.91.40:

6402.91.42	Protective active footwear (except footwear with waterproof molded bottoms, including bottoms comprising an outer sole and all or part of the upper and except footwear with insulation that provides protection against cold weather), whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 15.34 cm	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, R, SG)	35%	"
------------	---	-----	---	-----	---

(2) By inserting immediately preceding subheading 6402.99.33 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.99.32 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.99.33:

6402.99.32	Protective active footwear	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, IL, JO, MA, MX, P) 1% (PA) 6% (OM) 6% (PE) 12% (CO) 20% (KR)	35%	"
------------	----------------------------------	-----	--	-----	---

(c) STAGED RATE REDUCTIONS.—The staged reductions in special rates of duty proclaimed for subheading 6402.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be applied to subheading 6402.99.32 of such Schedule, as added by subsection (b)(2), beginning in calendar year 2016.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall—

- (1) take effect on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and
- (2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 15th day.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. REPORT ON CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS TO REDUCING POVERTY AND ELIMINATING HUNGER.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing

the contribution of the trade preference programs of the United States, including the Generalized System of Preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.), the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.

TITLE VI—OFFSETS

SEC. 601. CUSTOMS USER FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “July 7, 2025”.

(b) RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.—Section 503 of the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking “June 30, 2021” and inserting “June 30, 2025”.

SEC. 602. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 5.25 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 603. ELIMINATION OF MODIFICATION OF THE MEDICARE SEQUESTER FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), section 251A(6)(D)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a(6)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking “0.25 percent” and inserting “0.0 percent”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not take effect unless the Trade Act of 2015 is enacted and if the Trade Act of 2015 is enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, such amendment shall be executed as if this Act had been enacted after the date of the enactment of such other Act

SEC. 604. PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIRED TO CLAIM CERTAIN EDUCATION TAX BENEFITS.

(a) AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY CREDIT, HOPE SCHOLARSHIP CREDIT, AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 25A(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no credit shall be allowed under this section unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.”

(2) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—Section 25A(g)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(C) a statement described in paragraph (8) and received by such individual shall be treated as received by the taxpayer.”

(b) DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—Section 222(d) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7) and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.

“(B) STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.—The receipt of the statement referred to in subparagraph (A) by an individual described in subsection (c)(3) shall be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as received by the taxpayer.”

(c) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED ON PAYEE STATEMENT.—Section 6050S(d)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the information required by subsection (b)(2).”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 605. SPECIAL RULE FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS UNABLE TO COLLECT TINs OF INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6724 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR RETURNS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.—No penalty shall be imposed under section 6721 or 6722 solely by reason of failing to provide the TIN of an individual on a return or statement required by section 6050S(a)(1) if the eligible educational institution required to make such return contemporaneously makes a true and accurate certification under penalty of perjury (and in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary) that it has complied with standards promulgated by the Secretary for obtaining such individual’s TIN.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be made, and statements required to be furnished, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 606. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT INFORMATION RETURNS AND PROVIDE PAYEE STATEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6721(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”, and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(b) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(1) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6721(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”,

(B) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”, and

(C) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(2) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6721(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”,

(B) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$250”, and

(C) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(c) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.—Section 6721(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”, and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”,

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”, and

(B) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”, and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”, and

(B) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(d) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6721(e) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”, and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(e) FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6722(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”, and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(2) REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.—

(A) CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.—Section 6722(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”,

(ii) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”, and

(iii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(B) FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.—Section 6722(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”,

(ii) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by clause (i)) and inserting “\$250”, and

(iii) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(3) LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.—Section 6722(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”, and

(ii) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”,

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”, and

(ii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”, and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”, and

(ii) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(4) PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.—Section 6722(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”, and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to returns and statements required to be filed after December 31, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 10, 2015, as modified by the order of the House of today, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1295, the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of the Trade Preferences Extension Act. This bill will strengthen America by promoting free enterprise all around the world. First, we extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act for 10 years. AGOA allows African countries to sell their goods in America duty free. This program is a very essential program. It strengthens ties between our countries because when America grows, they grow too.

I also want to thank Congressman RANGEL for his work on this. He is the champion of AGOA. He is one of the primary authors of AGOA, and he is the person who has done so much work throughout his career—having been chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, a leader in the committee—to help forge better ties between the nations of Africa and our country and to help the rising tide lift all of the boats, so I want to thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Second, we renew the Generalized System of Preferences through December 2017. GSP lowers duties on thousands of products around the developing world. We make a few changes in the bill, and I want to articulate those changes.

We make eligible for GSP things like purses, briefcases, and backpacks, but only after they receive extensive review and only if they are found to be nonimport sensitive. This is a trade bill, so there are lots of things like this in trade bills.

The purpose of all of this is to give American consumers access to better products at better prices, to help grow the economies of America and the countries we are trading with in the developing world.

We create a new tariff line for recreational performance outerwear, outerwear that is not made here, but that we buy that is needlessly more expensive for consumers. We lower duties on things like hiking and running shoes.

I also want to thank Congressman BLUMENAUER and Congressman REICHERT for their work on performance outerwear and footwear. I also want to thank Congressman SMITH and Congressman CRENSHAW from Florida for their work on luggage. All of these programs have strong bipartisan support and say to the developing world: free enterprise, free enterprise is the way to go. That is the key to success. That is the key to upward mobility.

Third, we extend the HOPE and the HELP programs for products in Haiti for 10 years. These programs build up Haiti through trade and investment. That is the best kind of foreign aid and support you can have: more economic growth, more trade, more investment. They can create more opportunity and bring our countries closer together. That is why it is critical that we continue these programs.

Finally, I would like to say a word about the offsets in this bill. This bill will eliminate the Medicare sequester extension that was in the TAA bill, and in exchange it will set up stronger tax compliance laws. We have reached a bipartisan compromise here. This fixes the concerns that Members on both sides of the aisle, particularly on the Republican side, the Doctors Caucus as we call it, had about the Medicare sequester, and it removes the Medicare sequester.

These are commonsense programs that are fully paid for. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the legislation. It passed with a huge bipartisan margin over in the Senate, and I hope and expect that it will do so, as well, here.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this is more than just a trade bill. I want to thank Chairman RYAN for making certain that this did not come anywhere near the controversies that surround us in the trade area, which he could have done; but he made certain that this extension of AGOA, the support for Haiti, and also the GSP would not be surrounded with controversy but would move seamlessly.

I want to thank, also, ED ROYCE of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for being so cooperative in each stage of the way. It is a moving period for me because there hasn't been this type of cooperation between the House and the Senate or Republicans and Democrats in a long time, and it feels extremely good. I want to thank you for this and to realize that it is not just African countries, it is expansion of what I think our great country is all about, that it is not really just to exercise the economic power that we have, but to explore the potential that other countries have, especially in Africa that has been bypassed for so many, many decades.

I want to thank JIM MCDERMOTT, who was one of the original authors; Phil Crane, who was the chairman of the committee; and, of course, then-Speaker Gingrich, who was the first witness that we had for this bill. With roots like that, it probably carried over so that we can have this extension so that investors and importers of Africa and the African people themselves will be able to have a better idea of not where they are today, but where they can go with the cooperation of developing countries so that we will have

the true meaning of peace, and that is through prosperity.

As far as Haiti is concerned, again, we have found throughout the world a general compassion for all of the things that we would want for other people that we enjoy ourselves, and by extending this through 2025, it gives them a better handle on what they can do in the future.

GSP has been with us since the 1970s, and we hope that developing countries can graduate into being full-fledged partners.

Again, as I said earlier, there has been no one like Dr. JIM MCDERMOTT, who brought his experiences from the Peace Corps, having served in these countries and feeling in the marrow of his bones what we had to do. I have already given my appreciation, but he just walked in at the right time, as he usually does, and I would like to thank him publicly once again.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Senate AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015.

Today is a proud day for those of us who are deeply concerned about doing what we can to promote growth in developing countries. We are preparing to vote on a bipartisan bill that would extend preferences not only for African countries, but for Haiti, and developing countries more generally. I want to thank Chairman RYAN for working so closely with us on this bill, which has been a high priority for me this Congress.

AGOA

Let me talk about AGOA first. There is widespread enthusiasm about Africa these days. We know it's a continent that's poised for explosive growth. I am hopeful that growth will materialize. And that our program, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, will help fuel that growth.

In this country, our philosophy of trade and development has been to give poor countries a leg up on access to our market. That creates an incentive for importers to source from those countries, and it also builds relationships among our countries.

Some advanced economies have taken a different approach. They've forced developing countries, especially in Africa, to agree to substandard trade agreements instead of one-way preferences. One of the participants in the AGOA Forum last summer told us privately how much he appreciates the fact that the United States doesn't take that approach—that we don't view Africa as a continent full of natural resources to be exploited, but rather that it's our responsibility as a wealthy nation to provide a path for poor countries to develop.

We have seen countries participate in our preference programs, and then come to us asking to do free trade agreements. That's what happened with CAFTA/DR a decade ago. We are more than willing to do that—When they're ready and willing. And I think in the next 10 years, we're going to see quite a few countries in sub-Saharan Africa decide that entering into a two-way trade agreement with the United States is something they want to do, something they think will benefit them as well as us. The bill we're considering today pushes USTR to figure out a way to make that happen, without forcing anybody into doing a deal with us.

I'm excited to see where sub-Saharan Africa is headed, and for our country to do its part to help move those countries up the path of development.

But we should be clear—I we also benefit from this program, even if the preferences don't go both ways. Our businesses are able to source inputs from African countries without paying duty, and that in turn makes us more competitive, whether it's selling the finished product domestically, or exporting it to a third country.

I want to thank Congresswoman KAREN BASS for her tireless work to make this renewal happen. She is an advocate not just for Africa, but for policies that will promote real change in Africa. I know in the coming months we will be looking at ways to improve trade capacity building in Africa, and I am committed to working with her and our colleagues on Foreign Affairs to find a way to get that done.

HAITI

We're also extending the Haiti programs through 2025. Some provisions in the Haiti program begin to expire this year. We know from our own conversations with the Administration that the Haitians, perhaps more than any other country, need a long-term extension of the program in order to attract investment. We hear that some factories in Haiti are at capacity—which is wonderful—but that for Haitian-owned businesses to be able to attract the capital to expand, the preferences have to be extended across a longer horizon so that investors will feel satisfied that they can recoup their investment. By extending preferences through 2025, we do that. We must recognize my friend, Senator BILL NELSON, who has been a champion for the people of Haiti and has been instrumental in crafting these provisions and getting them done.

GSP

Finally, we renew the Generalized System of Preferences, which expired almost two years ago. GSP has been the foundation of our trade and development program since 1975. This program provides preferences to a wide range of countries, across the development spectrum.

We've been fortunate to see countries become more and more developed, to the point where we are able to graduate them from the program and let them compete without needing the duty-free preference. I think it's unfortunate that we can't extend the program for a longer period of time, but the fact is, the program is so successful that finding offsets to pay for it has been a challenge. But it is my hope that GSP does not lapse again, and that next time, we're able to renew it ahead of time.

One thing I need to mention is the Senate inclusion of a provision that authorizes the President to review whether some goods should be made eligible for duty-free treatment under GSP. This is known as "GSP Update." We know that some domestic groups feel that some of those items are sensitive and should not be designated duty-free. So while we are supporting the inclusion of GSP Update in this bill, if and when the time comes to consider these goods for GSP, we urge the President to take into account the concerns that have been raised. I'll provide the clerk with a list of the items that domestic groups have flagged, so that it can be entered into the record.

OUTDOOR ACT

We are also including provisions that will allow us to keep track of imports of rec-

reational clothing. These aren't preferences, but the Senate included them, and we have House Members who support the provision.

My colleagues who have advocated for this bill have noted that we need to do more to promote enjoyment of the great outdoors, and their goal is, eventually, to see if it's possible to remove duties on at least some of these goods.

But to enjoy the great outdoors, there must be great outdoors to enjoy, not just here, but around the world. My friend Mr. DOGGETT has for many years advocated including a criterion in GSP that would require beneficiaries to take steps to protect the environment. If there is an effort to make any of these goods duty-free at some point in the future, it would be my hope that those efforts would be paired with the kind of GSP criterion Mr. DOGGETT has advocated.

CONCLUSION

Looking at the bigger picture, there is so much support for these programs that a similar bill passed almost unanimously in the Senate last month. And I imagine the same will happen here today. I look forward to a time when we won't need preference packages at all, when the poorest of nations will have reached a level of development and productive capacity that they can compete with any other country. We are not there, but programs like the ones we're extending today will help them get there.

Supplemental Rangel Statement on HR 1295—Potentially Sensitive Items for GSP, by Harmonized Tariff Schedule Number

4202.12.40
4202.12.60
4202.12.80
4202.22.40
4202.22.45
4202.22.60
4202.22.80
4202.32.40
4202.32.80
4202.32.95
4202.92.08
4202.92.15
4202.92.20
4202.92.30
4202.92.90

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will just add a couple responses before I yield to the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee.

I appreciate the gentleman's kind words. This is a bipartisan bill, and there is a time sensitivity here. It is very important, particularly for African nations in AGOA, that this gets done very quickly so that the proper signals are sent to the investors, to the factories, to the employers so that people can keep their jobs. That is one of the many reasons why we wanted to honor the commitment with the gentlewoman from California, with the gentleman from New York, to keep this distinct and separate and to get it moving through. So it is our intention that this gets moved through here, and then it is off and done.

I just want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their indulgence. This is one of those kind of rare, these days, moments of bipartisan support where this is good, and this is something that we should all be

pleased that we are seeing done. It elevates our principles. It forges our ties with other countries. And in the time sensitive nature of this, I am glad that we could come together and get this done like we are.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my congratulations to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. RYAN, for the bipartisan nature of the work on this bill. Without his leadership, it wouldn't have happened. I also appreciate the leadership of the ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee, Mr. RANGEL, who has been an advocate for this for a long, long time; Ranking Member LEVIN; the gentleman from Washington State, as it has been pointed out, and his leadership as well; the gentlewoman from California; Chairman ROYCE from California; as well as Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, who has been a strong advocate of getting this done, and getting this done quickly, as the chairman said. The entire process of developing a long-term extension and enhancement of AGOA reflects the strong bipartisan commitment that has always surrounded this issue and the bipartisan commitment of our chairman.

AGOA has been a clear success of economic development and in national security terms as well. In the last 15 years since it was enacted, it has become the cornerstone of our relationship with Africa. Since AGOA was enacted, trade has tripled and investment has grown almost sixfold. By one estimate, AGOA supports well over a million direct and indirect jobs in sub-Saharan Africa and about 100,000 jobs in the United States of America. We know the countries that participate in AGOA have higher average incomes per person and higher good governance scores, including on the rule of law and political stability criteria, than sub-Saharan African countries that do not participate in the program.

The bill we are considering today will extend AGOA for 10 years, the longest extension that Congress has ever considered for this program. It also strengthens the program by simplifying certain rules of origin, encouraging greater regional integration, building additional flexibility, improving certainty and predictability, and expanding transparency and participation in the AGOA review process.

For all its successes, we have also heard concerns about conditions in sub-Saharan Africa, including very significant concerns in South Africa, on issues that affect the agriculture industry, like in my State, poultry and pork. We have worked to correct that. The bill provides new mechanisms for addressing these concerns, including a petition process and an out-of-cycle review.

The bill also renews the General System of Preferences program through

2017 and provides retroactive relief to eligible products that were imported during the GSP's lapse. GSP promotes economic development by providing duty-free treatment for approximately 5,000 nonsensitive products from 126 developing countries. Employers in my district use this so they can grow their business and create more American jobs.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill ensures that Haiti will continue to benefit from the HELP and HOPE programs by extending those preferences through 2025. This will encourage continued investment in Haiti and support its economic development and recovery efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), one of the authors of the original AGOA, and the people in South Africa as well as the United States are deeply indebted.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here today and to congratulate CHARLIE.

Most people don't remember 1995. That is when we did a bill called NAFTA, and tucked away in NAFTA was the beginning, the seeds of this particular bill. It didn't pass until 2000 when Newt Gingrich was Speaker. Newt Gingrich ought to get at least a little bit of an acknowledgment for his part in all of this.

Our goal then was to set up a proposal in trade that would allow for sustainable development in Africa. The last 15 years we have really achieved that goal, and that is why we are reauthorizing it today. This 10-year extension gives businesses an opportunity to actually plan.

What we have done over the last few years have been very short extensions, which has been very hard for the business community to make plans when they don't know whether it is going to be here at the next session.

One company in particular came in and told me that they want to create a vertically integrated process for producing clothing in Africa, everything from growing the seeds to spinning the yarn to producing the fabric. Now, this will require a major investment on their part. This long-term renewal of AGOA will provide that business with the certainty needed to make investments. When they go to the bank, the question is: How long is this actually going to last? They now can say "10 years" when they go to get the money to do this.

Once again, I am very proud and pleased to have been a part of this, and I think it shows that we can work together on things like trade.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), a distinguished Member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1245

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I thank the Chairman for yielding and for working to bring these issues to the floor.

This bill includes a number of critical reauthorizations, including AGOA, the Generalized System of Preferences, and trade with Haiti. It is an important first step as we address trade today and tomorrow.

I also want to thank the chairman for working with me and a number of other Members to ensure the inclusion of provisions in this bill to modernize the treatment of travel goods, performance outerwear, and footwear.

The GSP UPDATE Act, included in this bill, would allow the International Trade Commission to consider whether travel goods such as suitcases and backpacks are import sensitive. If, and only if, the ITC determines they are not, they would become eligible for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences.

Such a determination would be constructive for us, as well as our trade partners. This would mean increasing stability and economic growth in the developing world. It would also mean greater opportunities for retailers and consumers here in our country as we expand the availability of products.

Again, I thank the chairman for this provision's inclusion, and I urge passage.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, after 45 years in the House, I would be less than honest to say that there is certain legislation that I have concern with in terms of what happens after I leave this Congress, but I am so pleased to say that the gentlewoman from California has taken this little baby and nursed it to make certain that she would be the mother of the extension and that it will continue to grow.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. I rise today in support of H.R. 1891, the AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015.

I am delighted to be here to speak in favor of an extraordinarily important bill, of which AGOA is part, and to be joined by my distinguished colleague, Ranking Member RANGEL. I do have to say that it is quite appropriate that we are voting on this bill today, as it is Mr. RANGEL's birthday. As one of the original authors of AGOA, we extend this birthday present to him because I know that it will pass with bipartisan support.

I also want to acknowledge the work of one of the other original authors, Mr. McDERMOTT, for the longtime support of the nations in Africa and to acknowledge several Ambassadors that are here in the gallery from Lesotho, South Africa; Niger; and Gabon.

I also want to thank the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RYAN. I appreciate his timing. He made a commitment as soon as he took over as chair. He received numerous delegations from the continent. He made that commitment. He followed through on

it, in particular, the timing, because it was so important that the chair and ranking member and chair of the subcommittee, Mr. TIBERI, that we did this soon so that we didn't wait until AGOA was near expiration.

We did that a couple of years ago with third-country fabric, and we found that many jobs on the continent were lost. I want to thank him for his leadership and following through.

The importance of reauthorizing AGOA—and by doing so, strengthening trade and investment between the United States and the nations of Africa—is clear. Since its enactment in 2001, AGOA has helped to significantly increase African exports to the United States and led to jobs both on the African Continent and here at home.

AGOA has generated approximately 100,000 jobs in the U.S. and 350,000 direct jobs and 1 million indirect jobs in Sub-Saharan Africa. A byproduct of this trade is the increase of U.S. exports.

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

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

Ms. BASS. Over the past decade, numerous countries on the continent of Africa have consistently been cited by international financial institutions as the fastest growing economies in the world.

Without question, I am pleased to have been part of this important process. I also look forward to continuing my work with my fellow Members of Congress and the administration in strengthening trade and investment relations between our country and home to the world's fastest growing economies and newest and most dynamic trade and investment frontier, Africa.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), one of our newer Members who has taken a particular interest in the issue of trade. It matters greatly to the jobs in his district in Minnesota.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of the legislation that I am holding in my hand right now, the trade promotion authority bill.

Tomorrow, the House will be voting on the passage of TPA, which is a vital step in ensuring America's future success as a nation. Whenever I get asked why—Why is it important? Why is American trade important?—I say it is not just important to Minnesota, it is important to the entire country, but I will use my State as the starter.

The State of Minnesota is still home to 18 Fortune 500 companies, and the two main drivers of our private economy—our success—are agriculture and manufacturing.

American trade is important. It is important to ensure that our superior workforce, our quality companies and products, have full and fair access to other markets around the world.

Let me be clear, TPA is not a trade deal in itself; rather, TPA is legislation

that authorizes the President to enter into an agreement only after Congress and the American people have given their approval.

It contains 150 objectives that Congress mandates the U.S. Trade Representative must adhere to during negotiations. It has a provision that allows the House to withdraw TPA at any time during its 6-year authorization, effectively stopping any bad agreement in its tracks. It requires that any deal must be public for a minimum of 60 days before any vote or considerations taken by Congress.

I want to thank Chairmen RYAN and TIBERI for their work on this important legislation. It is time for America to lead again, which is why I urge my colleagues to support the passage of trade promotion authority.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee that brought this matter of luggage to our attention in the first place.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I rise in support of passage of H.R. 1295, the Trade Preferences Extension Act, and I want to thank Chairman RYAN and Chairman TIBERI for their hard work and dedication in getting this important piece of legislation to the floor.

This bill contains many beneficial trade programs that have furthered our Nation's foreign policy and national security goals. Specifically, this bill renews the Generalized System of Preferences program and includes legislation that I authored, along with Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, on a commonsense and helpful update to the GSP program.

The GSP program helps many designated beneficiary developing countries around the world. Stable countries with employed and productive citizens lead to a safe global environment that deters wars, terrorist groups, and violent uprisings and further allows our allies to develop their own economies, health care, and educational systems.

The GSP UPDATE, which would add travel goods to the list of items eligible for review, would specifically benefit our ally the Philippines, which has suffered multiple devastating weather events. It will also help Cambodia, one of the poorest countries in the world.

Goods are not eligible for the GSP program if they are "import sensitive" or compete with U.S. goods. This is decided by the International Trade Commission. Therefore, having travel and luggage items placed on the GSP-eligible list does not automatically give them preferential trade status.

The overall GSP program is a win-win for the U.S. and our allies around the world. Through this program, we are able to help countries develop their economies with little cost to the United States Government.

I want to thank Chairman RYAN for all of his hard work. I urge passage of this bill, the Trade Preferences Extension Act.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), one of the House's most active supporters of free trade and fair trade and who has made an outstanding contribution to this legislation.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. It is a bill that came out of the Senate 99-1, with wide bipartisan support; and why not? It has worked well for us in the past. It will work well for us in the future.

This is our opportunity to meaningfully engage the African nations when it comes to trade preferences to make sure that we maintain a healthy and strong relationship with a vibrant and growing area of the world, along with some other developing nations, and Haiti, for instance, that Mr. RANGEL has been particularly focused on, too. I would encourage my colleagues to support it.

This also fixes a problem that we have had in regard to the trade agenda that we are trying to move forward on this week. There was some concern about how the Trade Adjustment Assistance bill was going to be paid for, what offsets were being used. That now is being fixed in this bill as well through a bipartisan agreement.

I commend the chair of the Ways and Means committee and the Republican leadership for their willingness to compromise on this issue, to make sure that this does not become a hurdle or a roadblock to advancing our trade agenda as a nation. So that is in the bill. I think Members of Congress need confidence that that offset has been fixed and paid for.

It is my understanding that the Senate plans on moving quickly, expeditiously, in order to take up this amended version and pass it on their side, so no Member should be under any illusion that there is a problem for the pay-for right now with Trade Adjustment Assistance.

Overall, the basis of this bill is something that has worked and benefited us in the past. It is the reason why there was overwhelming bipartisan support in the Senate. We should have overwhelming bipartisan support on the floor of the House today.

I commend the leadership of the committee, Ranking Member RANGEL and the work that he has put in, and I encourage a "yes" vote on this underlying legislation.

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

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

I want to take this time to thank the chairman for changing the pay-for for the TAA. I just wondered, after that very difficult and complex negotiation, why in the world they would tie that

up with TPA. That means that those votes now, it is my understanding, procedurally, it would be one vote, and you won't have a chance to vote for TPA and TAA separately.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Could you rephrase the question? I didn't catch it all.

Mr. RANGEL. It is my understanding that the TAA complex pay-for has been taken care of under your leadership under the bill that is before us. My question was: Why in the world would you tie that up with TPA?

When you accomplish one problem, it seems like you complicated that by not allowing the House to have two separate votes on two entirely separate issues.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The bills came over from the other body together—both policies, TAA and TPA, in the same bill; that is why these are not separate bills, but they are separate votes.

As the gentleman knows from his years of experience here, we can always choose to divide the question on a particular bill. We have chosen to divide the question on that forthcoming bill between TPA and TAA.

The issue before us right here is not just preferences, which is important for all the reasons we specified, but it also fixes the pay-for problem that, on both sides of the aisle, Members had concerns with.

The bill coming over from the Senate has both issues together. We are simply dividing the question and having votes on each policy separately.

Mr. RANGEL. Reclaiming my time, I am glad to hear that.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), and I thank him publicly for the great work that he has put into this issue, as well as all the important issues.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and his leadership. It was my intention to engage in a colloquy with the chairman in a few minutes, but I wanted to make a couple of observations, if I could, about the subject at hand.

As Mr. RANGEL knows from his years of effort, one of our responsibilities in terms of promoting free and fair trade is to be able to focus attention on some of the poorest countries around the world.

□ 1300

I appreciate your work, what the committee is doing—in the past and moving forward—to be able to deal with some of the anomalies where some of the worst, heaviest tariff burdens are on some of the poorest of countries, and our being able to extend to less-developed countries opportunities to earn their own way, to have some modicum

of tariff relief, to be able to promote their indigenous activities.

Trade is cheaper than aid, and it helps them strengthen their economies, strengthen their societies, and I really appreciate tireless efforts to extend those opportunities to others.

I think we have got a long way to go in terms of being able to deal with some of the poorest of countries. We have got trade promotion authority we may be talking about with a dozen countries. But there are other poor countries around the world that we need to work with to be able to pull into opportunities for them to grow their economies, for them to be able to trade with us, to be able to strengthen civil society, and partnerships.

So I wanted to thank you for your years of effort in this. I wanted to express my appreciation for the underlying bill.

I look forward to chatting a little further with the chairman when one of our partners surfaces.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), my friend and distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, one of the most knowledgeable persons in the House on the issue of trade.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. RANGEL.

I stand in support of this bipartisan legislation, which passed the Senate by a vote of 99-1. It includes preferences that are critical to so many economies in the developing world: the African Growth and Opportunity Act, or AGOA, a core of close economic partnerships between the United States and a host of African nations; the Generalized System of Preferences, tariff preferences which help developing countries compete and build their economies worldwide; the Haiti HOPE and HELP programs, which provide duty-free treatment for certain Haitians to help Haitians build a 21st century economy.

And I know that my constituents have been calling for the passage of these provisions for many, many months.

As I have traveled to many affected nations, they too have experienced and expressed the serious and dire consequences that they could suffer without these benefits.

This is not just about helping other nations. The fact is, right here in the United States, exports grow as a result of increased trade with these nations that results from extending preferences in trade and investment flows—critical to my district and districts all across the United States. It is critically important.

And I compliment, also, Chairman RYAN, for putting this together in a way that we can pass it in a bipartisan way, because this is an important aspect of also making sure that we are secure because, as we help these nations on their feet and put them in part of the global economy, we are making

sure that we are giving hope and opportunity to all.

So I heartily support, and ask everyone to support this bipartisan bill, which passed, again, 99-1 in the Senate. Collectively, we are going to make this place a better place.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Mr. MEEKS, the gentleman who just left. He has been a great leader on this issue, on trade.

Let me explain to those who are watching who aren't steeped in the intricacies of the trade law: what this bill is, the bill with respect to Haiti, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, GSP, it is trade, not aid. It is combining the need in America for high-quality, lower-cost goods that are not made in America with the need for economic growth and jobs in developing countries. It is a win-win.

Take Africa, for example. People are getting opportunity. People are getting jobs. People are getting out of poverty, and they are making products that Americans need, that Americans don't make right here. And we are getting high-quality, lower-priced products as a result of it.

So that means, for the hard-working taxpayer in Wisconsin, for the hard-working taxpayer in New York and throughout America, they are stretching their dollar more. That means their paycheck goes farther. That means that they are buying shoes for their kids or blankets at home or towels, or luggage. They can buy more of it. It doesn't cost as much.

That means their take-home pay can go to that and even more things because it gives them more take-home pay. That is why it is good for us.

And why it is good for people in the developing world is it is helping them build an economy. It is helping them attract manufacturers and exporters who create jobs and opportunity.

So, as a component of our foreign policy, it is so important. You have heard it a million times: we believe in trade, not aid. You teach a man how to fish instead of feeding him a fish. We all know the parables we can get into. That is what this is.

This says, let's work together to grow your economy, to be independent, to be self-sufficient, to help people get more opportunity to pull themselves out of poverty. That is in the interest of the human person involved, but it is also in the interest of our countries, so that we can help the developing world get into the First World, so that we can help the developing world raise their living standards.

And by the way, just from a brass tacks, material standpoint, having the developing world grow, having people enter the middle class in other countries means more customers for our products. It means more trade for us.

But, from an international standpoint, from a foreign policy standpoint,

it means these countries are more secure. They are more safe. They are more prosperous. And they enter the world from a developing nation to the developed world. That is good for everybody. That is good for all.

That is why this is one of the more important components of our foreign policy as a country and our economic policy, in general.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). The gentleman from New York has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. And I just want to take a moment to recognize the chairman, the ranking member, the subcommittee chairman and ranking member, for their work on this critical legislation.

South Florida, where I hail from, is home to thousands of Haitian Americans, and I know that they will soon be expressing their gratitude to this House, to this Congress, for passing this important bipartisan legislation.

This legislation is going to provide opportunity, hope for the people of the continent of Africa, but also for the people of Haiti. And in south Florida, we have a very special bond with Haiti. We know how much that country needs American involvement, opportunity.

And the relatives of so many Haitians who live in south Florida will be beaming with pride and gratitude when they get the news that this House has passed this critical legislation.

As Chairman RYAN says, this is not just trade legislation. This is foreign policy. This is foreign aid, but the aid that really helps people prosper, the aid that allows companies, governments to provide opportunity for their citizens.

This will also provide opportunity for our citizens. The more markets that we help create for our products, American businesses and American families will thrive.

For a long time, people have been complaining that the economic recovery has been weak; that it has left the people at the bottom behind. This is our opportunity to change that, to create more markets for American exports, to give people hope and opportunity, so that the United States can continue being that country, Mr. Speaker, where anyone who comes and wants to succeed and wants to work hard will have that opportunity. This is how we do it, and we also do it by working together.

All of us in this House want to strengthen Medicare, and today we have taken another important step toward strengthening Medicare. How? By working together. This is exactly what the American people sent us here to do.

For too long, Members of this House have refused to cooperate, have refused to find common ground. Well, we are doing that today, and I am so proud to be able to come to the floor of the House to congratulate our leaders for their fine work, and to offer my strong support of this important bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee and the chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time.

This is a really important bipartisan bill. I want to thank Mr. RANGEL for his work and, of course, Chairman RYAN.

This bill is important because it is part of our soft power. This is about how America exerts soft power in these regions. It is about helping to build trade capacity in the long run to get us to expanded commercial relations in areas of need.

This bill encourages the adoption and implementation of WTO agreements, including the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement, which eliminates red tape at the border, something that we have worked very hard to do and something that will benefit American companies in the long run, as well as our trading partners.

This encourages the development by AGOA beneficiaries of utilizing strategies to improve the effectiveness and use of the program to make this program more effective. It commits the United States to working with AGOA beneficiaries to develop and implement these kinds of strategies. It outlines a path for deepening and expanding trade and investment ties, all good for American national security, good for the American economy, good for job creation.

The Generalized System of Preferences program—extends this program until December 31, 2017. It provides retroactive relief to eligible products that were imported during the lapse of the program, and it implements U.S.-WTO commitments by making duty-free certain cotton articles eligible from least-developed beneficiary developing countries. All good policy.

With regard to Haiti—and my colleague spoke earlier about this—this extends the HOPE and HELP programs for products from Haiti until September 30, 2025; encourages foreign investment and job creation by extending trade preferences to reinvigorate the apparel industry and attract new and expanded foreign direct investment; and reaffirms U.S. foreign policy and national security interests by promoting trade and long-term investments in Haiti, as it does with the other countries in Africa through the AGOA program.

We also correct the program that we had earlier dealing with the Medicare sequester, supplementing the entire package with a different pay-for. I think that is more acceptable.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BOUSTANY. So this is really about achieving America's goals. This is about improving our economy. It is about growing jobs. It is about economic connectedness. It is about helping countries that have struggled and building newer relations and stronger commercial relationships with those countries.

This, ultimately, is about doing what America does best and extending our values worldwide.

I urge the support of this bill. It is a good bill. A lot of thought went into it on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the chairman's courtesy, as I have appreciated the opportunity to be working with you on the package that is coming forward. I know we are not quite there yet. I look forward to continuing this effort.

But I would like to engage in an issue that is critical to Mr. REICHERT, my colleague from the Northwest, to our consumers, and to important jobs in our district.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the innovative footwear industry must face an unreasonable reality at our borders. Two identical looking running shoes are imported. One must pay a significantly higher tariff for a single reason: it contains a waterproof liner. Waterproof means a lot in the Pacific Northwest, for Mr. REICHERT and I.

This bill puts an end to an outmoded tariff code that charges extremely high tariffs for no good reason.

□ 1315

I appreciate the chairman and the staff working with my team, with Mr. REICHERT to try to get this right for tariff relief for outdoor enthusiasts and business around the country, but there is another issue at work here.

Mr. REICHERT and I have been lead sponsors of the U.S. OUTDOOR Act that defines and creates tariff classification unique and specific to recreational performance outerwear and eliminates import duties on those apparel products. The Preference bill achieves one of these goals of the OUTDOOR Act by creating new definitions and tariff classifications for recreational performance outerwear.

Again, I appreciate your efforts, Mr. Chairman, and those of your staff to include the provision. It provides recognition that these are distinct, unique products that will help the industry better track the imports of rec-

reational performance outerwear and sets the stage for tariff relief.

However, due to a drafting error, I understand that the duty rates assigned are incorrect and, in most cases, will raise the tariffs on those products and, as a result, on small- and medium-sized outdoor businesses, if they are not corrected. In addition, I understand the agreed-to language on the definitions of recreational performance outerwear and the list of tariff lines should be included.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is a commitment from you and your staff to apply the correct duty rates and make the necessary changes to the definition in the conference report on the Customs reauthorization bill. I further understand that there is a very tight window here that we both know to get this done. The new classifications will come into effect in 15 days, after the Preference bill is signed into law.

I would appreciate your acknowledgement that I understand the commitment correctly and that we will be able to get it done within this timeframe.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, first, I wanted to just note for the record that the footwear provision lowers duty on outdoor activity shoes, athletic footwear, such as gym shoes, just to make sure we can clarify that.

I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and also the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), who is involved in this issue, for their leadership on recreational performance outerwear and footwear.

The provisions we included in this bill will lower costs for American consumers. It will expand opportunities for U.S. businesses in these key product areas. I share both your interest in ensuring that the recreational performance outerwear provisions in this bill do, in fact, achieve their intended results in a revenue-neutral fashion. We have already been working with you on these provisions, and we commit to continue to do so in the conference discussions on the Customs Trade Facilitation and Enforcement Act. So I want to commit to you to making a good-faith effort to work through these highly technical provisions and to do it in a very quick timeframe.

We anticipate a very quick and relatively brief conference so that we can get these issues resolved in a very quick and timely fashion.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate that very much. And I hope that there is one area that we might be able to engage in some activity in the future.

According to a 2007 report by the ITC, there is no commercially viable production of recreational performance outerwear in the United States, yet these products still face tariffs averaging 14 percent, and some go up to almost 30 percent. So I look forward to

continuing to work with you to achieve the next goal of the OUTDOOR Act, which would be duty elimination.

As was discussed before, there is no viable domestic production, very high rates. There are not many opportunities to pursue tariff relief anymore because we have been moving in that direction, and I think that is important. But I look forward to working with you to find the appropriate offset, to deal with revenue neutrality, and enact tariff relief on those products as soon as we can.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his interest. I share his interest, and I appreciate his indulgence.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, once again, I want to thank Chairman RYAN. He epitomizes what can happen when we find a cause that is good for our country and good for the rest of the world.

I thank Speaker BOEHNER, who allowed this meaningful leadership agreement to move forward; Congressman NUNES, who enthusiastically supported the extension of AGOA; my dear and long-time friend from Utah, Senator HATCH, who managed to keep the bill as clean as possible during this journey with the other house; Senator BILL NELSON, who is a longtime friend and supporter of the extension of the trade agreement that we have with Haiti; and also the African Diplomatic Corps. They certainly did gain the confidence of Republicans and Democrats as they shared their problems and their ability to overcome some of the objections that Members had.

But most of all, and I know that Chairman RYAN joins me in thanking the staff on both sides of the aisle. We can come up with the great ideas, as we normally do, but it takes the staff to put them in the position and put the legislation in place so that we can move forward with it. So on behalf of the chairman and all of the Members that have played a part in the historic extension of this legislation, I want to thank the staff members that made it possible to bring us to this point that we can pass this important piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on my side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from New York. This is an issue that he has been passionate about for a long time that he, along with other leaders here, championed.

I, too, want to thank the staff for working very well with each other on this issue. We know that this is a win-win.

To our colleagues who haven't been paying attention to this, this bill

makes a big difference. It makes a big difference. It makes a big difference for our constituents, for consumers at home, and it makes a big difference for people who are aspiring to live a dream, who are aspiring to get themselves out of poverty, who are aspiring to make a good life for themselves and their children.

This is something that we should all be proud of, and I am very pleased that we have the kind of bipartisan coalition that we have on this issue. So that is why I urge a "yes" vote.

I am also pleased we were able to fix the other issues, such as sequester, in this bill. And I think, for all of those reasons, we should vote "yes" on this.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 10, 2015, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 32, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

YEAS—397

Abraham	Cartwright	Dingell
Adams	Castor (FL)	Doggett
Aderholt	Castro (TX)	Dold
Aguilar	Chabot	Donovan
Allen	Chaffetz	Doyle, Michael
Amodei	Chu, Judy	F.
Ashford	Ciilline	Duckworth
Barletta	Clark (MA)	Edwards
Barr	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Barton	Clay	Ellmers (NC)
Bass	Cleaver	Emmer (MN)
Beatty	Clyburn	Engel
Becerra	Coffman	Eshoo
Benishek	Cohen	Esty
Bera	Cole	Farenthold
Beyer	Collins (GA)	Farr
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Fattah
Bishop (GA)	Comstock	Fincher
Bishop (MI)	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Connolly	Fleischmann
Black	Cook	Fleming
Blackburn	Cooper	Flores
Blum	Costa	Forbes
Blumenauer	Costello (PA)	Fortenberry
Bonamici	Courtney	Foster
Bost	Cramer	Fox
Boustany	Crawford	Frankel (FL)
Boyle, Brendan	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
F.	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Fudge
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Gabbard
Brooks (IN)	Cummings	Gallego
Brown (FL)	Curbelo (FL)	Garamendi
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Gibbs
Buchanan	Davis, Danny	Gibson
Bucshon	Davis, Rodney	Gohmert
Burgess	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Bustos	DeGette	Graham
Butterfield	Delaney	Granger
Byrne	DeLauro	Graves (GA)
Calvert	DeBene	Graves (LA)
Capps	Denham	Graves (MO)
Capuano	Dent	Grayson
Cárdenas	DeSantis	Green, Al
Carney	DeSaunier	Green, Gene
Carson (IN)	DesJarlais	Griffith
Carter (GA)	Deutch	Grijalva
Carter (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Grothman

Guinta	Maloney, Sean	Ryan (OH)
Guthrie	Marchant	Ryan (WI)
Gutiérrez	Marino	Sánchez, Linda
Hahn	Matsui	T.
Hanna	McCarthy	Sanchez, Loretta
Hardy	McCaul	Sanford
Harper	McClintock	Sarbanes
Harris	McCollum	Scalise
Hartzler	McDermott	Schakowsky
Hastings	McGovern	Schiff
Heck (NV)	McHenry	Schrader
Heck (WA)	McKinley	Scott (VA)
Hensarling	McMorris	Scott, Austin
Herrera Beutler	Rodgers	Scott, David
Hice, Jody B.	McNerney	Sensenbrenner
Higgins	McSally	Serrano
Hill	Meadows	Sessions
Himes	Meehan	Sewell (AL)
Hinojosa	Meeks	Sherman
Holding	Meng	Shimkus
Honda	Messer	Shuster
Hoyer	Mica	Simpson
Hudson	Miller (FL)	Sinema
Huelskamp	Miller (MI)	Sires
Huffman	Moolenaar	Slaughter
Huizenga (MI)	Moore	Smith (MO)
Hultgren	Moulton	Smith (NE)
Hurd (TX)	Mullin	Smith (NJ)
Hurt (VA)	Mulvaney	Smith (TX)
Israel	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Issa	Murphy (PA)	Speier
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Stefanik
Jeffries	Napolitano	Stewart
Jenkins (KS)	Neal	Stivers
Jenkins (WV)	Neugebauer	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson (GA)	Newhouse	Takai
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Takano
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	Thompson (MS)
Johnson, Sam	Norcross	Thompson (PA)
Jolly	Nunes	Thornberry
Joyce	O'Rourke	Tiberi
Kaptur	Olson	Tipton
Katko	Palazzo	Titus
Keating	Pallone	Tonko
Kelly (IL)	Pascrell	Torres
Kelly (MS)	Paulsen	Trott
Kelly (PA)	Payne	Tsongas
Kennedy	Pearce	Turner
Kildee	Pelosi	Upton
Kilmer	Perlmutter	Valadao
Kind	Perry	Van Hollen
King (IA)	Peters	Vargas
King (NY)	Pingree	Veasey
Kinzinger (IL)	Pittenger	Vela
Kirkpatrick	Pitts	Velázquez
Kline	Pocan	Visclosky
Knight	Poliquin	Wagner
Kuster	Pompeo	Walberg
LaMalfa	Price (NC)	Walden
Lamborn	Price, Tom	Walker
Lance	Quigley	Rangel
Langevin	Larsen (WA)	Ratcliffe
Larsen (WA)	Larson (CT)	Reed
Larson (CT)	Latta	Reichert
Latta	Lawrence	Renacci
Lee	Lee	Ribble
Levin	Levin	Rice (NY)
Lewis	Lewis	Rice (SC)
Lieu, Ted	Lieu, Ted	Richmond
Lipinski	Lipinski	Rigell
LoBiondo	LoBiondo	Roby
Loeb	Loeb	Roe (TN)
Loehner	Loehner	Rogers (AL)
Long	Long	Rogers (KY)
Love	Love	Rokita
Lowenthal	Lowenthal	Rooney (FL)
Lowey	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Lucas	Lucas	Roskam
Luetkemeyer	Luetkemeyer	Ross
Lujan Grisham	Lujan Grisham	Rothfus
(NM)	(NM)	Rouzer
Luján, Ben Ray	Luján, Ben Ray	Roybal-Allard
(NM)	(NM)	Royce
Lynch	Lynch	Ruiz
MacArthur	MacArthur	Ruppersberger
Maloney,	Maloney,	Rush
Carolyn	Carolyn	

NAYS—32

Amash	Garrett	Mooney (WV)
Babin	Gosar	Nugent
Brat	Hunter	Palmer
Bridenstine	Jones	Peterson
Brooks (AL)	Jordan	Poe (TX)
Buck	Labrador	Posey
Duffy	Labrador	Loudermilk
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Russell

Salmon Stutzman Westmoreland
Schweikert Weber (TX) Yoho

NOT VOTING—4

Clawson (FL) Gowdy
Conyers Thompson (CA)

□ 1355

Messrs. BRAT, MOONEY of West Virginia, BROOKS of Alabama, PETERSON, SCHWEIKERT, ROHRBACHER, WEBER of Texas, YOHO, and POE of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. KING of New York, GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. RUPPERSBERGER, LIPINSKI, MURPHY of Pennsylvania, RUSH, YOUNG of Alaska, and JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to concur 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. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 1295, I mistakenly voted “no.” I would like to vote “yes” on rollcall 345, the Motion to Concur in the Senate amendments with a House amendment to H.R. 1295.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1357

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the bill had been read through page 163, line 2.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

Amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment by Ms. LEE of California.

Amendment by Mr. SABLAN of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 231, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

AYES—196

Adams	Duncan (SC)	Loeb sack
Amash	Edwards	Lofgren
Ashford	Ellison	Lowenthal
Bass	Eshoo	Lowey
Beatty	Esty	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Becerra	Farr	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Benishck	Fattah	Lummis
Beyer	Poster	Maloney, Carolyn
Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean
Blum	Fudge	Malone y
Blumenauer	Gallego	Caroly n
Bonamici	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Boyle, Brendan F.	Garrett	Massie
Brady (PA)	Grayson	Matsui
Brooks (AL)	Green, Al	McCollum
Brownley (CA)	Green, Gene	McDermott
Buck	Griffith	McGovern
Burgess	Grijalva	McNerney
Butterfield	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Capps	Hahn	Miller (FL)
Capuano	Hastings	Miller (MI)
Cárdenas	Heck (WA)	Moulton
Carney	Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney
Castor (FL)	Higgins	Murphy (FL)
Castro (TX)	Himes	Nadler
Chu, Judy	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Cicilline	Honda	Neal
Clark (MA)	Huelskamp	Nolan
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	Nugent
Clay	Hurt (VA)	O'Rourke
Cleaver	Israel	Pallone
Clyburn	Issa	Pascrell
Cohen	Jackson Lee	Payne
Connolly	Jeffries	Pelosi
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Perry
Courtney	Jones	Peterson
Crowley	Kaptur	Pingree
Cummings	Keating	Pocan
Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)	Polis
DeFazio	Kennedy	Posey
DeGette	Kildee	Price (NC)
Delaney	Kilmer	Quigley
DeLauro	Kuster	Rangel
DelBene	Labrador	Ribble
DeSaulnier	Langevin	Rice (NY)
DesJarlais	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Deutch	Larson (CT)	Rigell
Dingell	Lawrence	Rohrabacher
Doggett	Lee	Rokita
Doyle, Michael F.	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Duckworth	Lewis	Rush
	Lieu, Ted	Ryan (OH)
	Lipinski	

Sánchez, Linda T.	Sires	Vargas
Sanchez, Loretta	Slaughter	Veasey
Sanford	Smith (WA)	Vela
Sarbanes	Speier	Velázquez
Schakowsky	Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky
Schiff	Takai	Walz
Schrader	Takano	Wasserman
Schweikert	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Scott (VA)	Thompson (PA)	Waters, Maxine
Scott, David	Titus	Watson Coleman
Sensenbrenner	Tonko	Welch
Serrano	Torres	Wilson (FL)
Sherman	Tsongas	Yarmuth
	Van Hollen	Yoho

NOES—231

Abraham	Graham	Paulsen
Aderholt	Granger	Pearce
Aguilar	Graves (GA)	Peters
Allen	Graves (LA)	Pittenger
Amodel	Graves (MO)	Pitts
Babin	Grothman	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Guinta	Poliquin
Barr	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barton	Hanna	Price, Tom
Bera	Hardy	Ratcliffe
Bilirakis	Harper	Reed
Bishop (MI)	Hartzler	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Black	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Hice, Jody B.	Roby
Bost	Hill	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Holding	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hoyer	Rogers (KY)
Brat	Hudson	Rooney (FL)
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Roskam
Brown (FL)	Hunter	Ross
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Rothfus
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Rouzer
Bustos	Jenkins (WV)	Royce
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Ruiz
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Jolly	Russell
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Carter (TX)	Joyce	Salmon
Cartwright	Katko	Scalise
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Sessions
Coffman	Kind	Sewell (AL)
Cole	King (IA)	Shimkus
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Shuster
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Simpson
Comstock	Kirkpatrick	Sinema
Conaway	Kline	Smith (MO)
Cook	Knight	Smith (NE)
Costa	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Lance	Stefanik
Crawford	Latta	Stewart
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Stivers
Cuellar	Long	Thornberry
Culberson	Loudermilk	Thornberry
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Tiberi
Davis (CA)	Lucas	Tipton
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Trott
Denham	Lynch	Turner
Dent	MacArthur	Upton
DeSantis	Marchant	Valadao
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Wagner
Dold	McCarthy	Walberg
Donovan	McCaul	Walden
Duffy	McClintock	Walker
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Walorski
Ellmers (NC)	McKinley	Walters, Mimi
Emmer (MN)	McMorris	Weber (TX)
Engel	Rodgers	Webster (FL)
Farenthold	McSally	Webster (FL)
Fincher	Meadows	Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Westerman
Fleischmann	Meng	Westmoreland
Fleming	Messer	Whitfield
Flores	Mica	Williams
Forbes	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Mullin	Wittman
Fox	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Woodall
Frelinghuysen	Newhouse	Yoder
Gabbard	Noem	Young (AK)
Gibbs	Norcross	Young (IA)
Gibson	Nunes	Young (IN)
Gohmert	Olson	Zeldin
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Zinke
Gosar	Palmer	

NOT VOTING—6

Clawson (FL)	Harris	Moore
Gowdy	Mooney (WV)	Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1400

Mr. STEWART changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. MULVANEY changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 270, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

AYES—157

Adams	Grayson	Murphy (FL)
Amash	Green, Al	Nadler
Ashford	Griffith	Napolitano
Bass	Grijalva	Neal
Beatty	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Becerra	Hahn	O'Rourke
Benishek	Hastings	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Higgins	Payne
Bonamici	Himes	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Pingree
Brooks (AL)	Honda	Pocan
Capps	Huffman	Polis
Capuano	Israel	Posey
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Carney	Jeffries	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rohrabacher
Castor (FL)	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Keating	Rush
Ciциlline	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kilmer	Sanford
Cleaver	Kuster	Sarbanes
Cohen	Langevin	Schakowsky
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Conyers	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lee	Scott, David
Crowley	Levin	Sensenbrenner
Cummings	Lewis	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Sires
DeFazio	Lofgren	Slaughter
DeGette	Lowenthal	Speier
DeLauro	Lowe	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Lujan Grisham	Takai
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Takano
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	(NM)	Titus
Doyle, Michael F.	Lynch	Tonko
Duncan (TN)	Maloney,	Tsongas
Edwards	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Esty	Massie	Vela
Farr	Matsui	Velázquez
Fattah	McCormack	Visclosky
Foster	McGovern	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Wasserman Schultz
Fudge	Meeks	
Galego	Moore	
Garamendi	Mulvaney	

Waters, Maxine	Welch	Yarmuth
Watson Coleman	Wilson (FL)	Yoho

NOES—270

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Pearce
Aguilar	Graves (MO)	Pelosi
Allen	Green, Gene	Perry
Amodei	Grothman	Peters
Babin	Guinta	Peterson
Barletta	Guthrie	Pittenger
Barr	Hanna	Pitts
Barton	Hardy	Poe (TX)
Bera	Harper	Poliquin
Beyer	Harris	Pompeo
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Price, Tom
Bishop (MI)	Heck (NV)	Ratcliffe
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Reed
Black	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Blackburn	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Blum	Hill	Ribble
Bost	Holding	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Hoyer	Richmond
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hudson	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Roby
Brat	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Brown (FL)	Hurd (TX)	Rokita
Brownley (CA)	Hurt (VA)	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Bustos	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Butterfield	Jolly	Royce
Byrne	Jordan	Ruppersberger
Calvert	Joyce	Russell
Carter (GA)	Katko	Ryan (WI)
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Salmon
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Chaffetz	Kind	Schrader
Clyburn	King (IA)	Schweikert
Coffman	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Kirkpatrick	Sewell (AL)
Collins (NY)	Kline	Sherman
Comstock	Knight	Shimkus
Conaway	Labrador	Shuster
Cook	LaMalfa	Simpson
Cooper	Lamborn	Sinema
Costa	Lance	Smith (MO)
Costello (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Smith (NE)
Cramer	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Lipinski	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Stefanik
Culberson	Long	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Stivers
Davis (CA)	Love	Stutzman
Delaney	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
Dent	Lummis	Tiberi
DeSantis	MacArthur	Tipton
DesJarlais	Marchant	Torres
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Trott
Dold	McCarthy	Turner
Donovan	McCauley	Upton
Duckworth	McClintock	Upton
Duffy	McHenry	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	McKinley	Vargas
Ellmers (NC)	McMorris	Wagner
Emmer (MN)	Rodgers	Walberg
Engel	McSally	Walden
Farenthold	Meadows	Walker
Fincher	Meehan	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	Meng	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Messer	Walz
Flores	Mica	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Westerman
Fox	Moolenaar	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Moulton	Williams
Gabbard	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Womack
Gibson	Newhouse	Woodall
Gohmert	Noem	Yoder
Goodlatte	Norcross	Young (AK)
Gosar	Nugent	Young (IA)
Graham	Nunes	Young (IN)
Granger	Olson	Zeldin
	Palazzo	Zinke
	Palmer	

NOT VOTING—6

Clawson (FL)	Deutch	Gowdy
Davis, Rodney	Ellison	Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1403

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 347, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 264, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

AYES—165

Adams	Fudge	Moore
Amash	Gabbard	Mulvaney
Ashford	Galego	Murphy (FL)
Bass	Garamendi	Nadler
Beatty	Grayson	Napolitano
Becerra	Green, Al	Neal
Benishek	Griffith	Nolan
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Bonamici	Hahn	Pascarell
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Payne
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Brooks (AL)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Capps	Himes	Pingree
Capuano	Hinojosa	Pocan
Cárdenas	Honda	Polis
Carney	Huffman	Posey
Carson (IN)	Israel	Price (NC)
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Rangel
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Ribble
Ciциlline	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Clark (MA)	Jones	Richmond
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Rohrabacher
Clay	Keating	Roybal-Allard
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Cohen	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Connolly	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda T.
Conyers	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Courtney	Kuster	Sanford
Crowley	Langevin	Sarbanes
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Schiff
DeFazio	Lawrence	Schrader
DeGette	Lee	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Levin	Scott, David
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Sensenbrenner
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Serrano
Dingell	Lowenthal	Sires
Doggett	Lowey	Slaughter
Doyle, Michael F.	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
Duncan (TN)	(NM)	Speier
Edwards	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Eshoo	Maloney,	Takai
Ellison	Carolyn	Takano
Engel	Massie	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Matsui	Titus
Esty	McCormack	Tonko
Farr	McDermott	Torres
Fattah	McGovern	Tsongas
Foster	McNerney	Van Hollen
Frankel (FL)	Meeks	Veasey
	Meng	Velázquez

Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch

Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

Welch
Wilson (FL)

Woodall
Yarmuth

NOES—264

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huiuzenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson

Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr

□ 1407

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABLAN
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from the Northern Mariana
Islands (Mr. SABLAN) on which further
proceedings were postponed and on
which the noes prevailed by voice vote.
The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.
A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 173, noes 256,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]
AYES—173

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
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
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr

Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Gohmert
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith

Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huiuzenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer

NOT VOTING—4

Byrne
Clawson (FL)
Gowdy
Thompson (CA)
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

Clawson (FL)
Davis, Rodney

Gowdy
Thompson (CA)

NOT VOTING—4

□ 1410

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 81, noes 347, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—81

Adams	Harris	Perry
Babin	Holding	Pingree
Barletta	Honda	Poliquin
Benishek	Hudson	Polis
Bilirakis	Huelskamp	Pompeo
Bost	Hurd (TX)	Price (NC)
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rangel
Burgess	Jones	Ratcliffe
Butterfield	Jordan	Rokita
Carson (IN)	King (IA)	Ross
Cartwright	Labrador	Rouzer
Davis, Rodney	Lawrence	Ruiz
DeFazio	Long	Ruppersberger
DeSantis	Loudermilk	Salmon
Duncan (SC)	Lujan Grisham	Sánchez, Linda
Emmer (MN)	(NM)	T.
Fleming	Luján, Ben Ray	Schiff
Foxx	(NM)	Sensenbrenner
Franks (AZ)	Lummis	Sinema
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (PA)
Gallego	Massie	Titus
Gohmert	McSally	Wagner
Gosar	Messer	Walker
Graham	Mooney (WV)	Watson Coleman
Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)	Weber (TX)
Griffith	Newhouse	Webster (FL)
Grijalva	Norcross	Westmoreland
Grothman	Pallone	Wilson (FL)

NOES—347

Abraham	Buck	Costa
Aderholt	Bucshon	Costello (PA)
Aguilar	Bustos	Courtney
Allen	Byrne	Cramer
Amash	Calvert	Crawford
Amodei	Capps	Crenshaw
Ashford	Capuano	Crowley
Barr	Cardenas	Cuellar
Barton	Carney	Culberson
Bass	Carter (GA)	Cummings
Beatty	Carter (TX)	Curbelo (FL)
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bera	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Beyer	Chabot	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Chaffetz	Delaney
Bishop (MI)	Chu, Judy	DeLauro
Bishop (UT)	Cicilline	DelBene
Black	Clark (MA)	Denham
Blackburn	Clarke (NY)	Dent
Blum	Clay	DeSaulnier
Blumenauer	Cleaver	DesJarlais
Bonamici	Clyburn	Deutch
Boustany	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Boyle, Brendan	Cohen	Dingell
F.	Cole	Doggett
Brady (PA)	Collins (GA)	Dold
Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)	Donovan
Brat	Comstock	Doyle, Michael
Bridenstine	Conaway	F.
Brooks (IN)	Connolly	Duckworth
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Duffy
Brownley (CA)	Cook	Duncan (TN)
Buchanan	Cooper	Edwards

Ellmers (NC)	Lee	Ros-Lehtinen
Engel	Levin	Roskam
Eshoo	Lewis	Rothfus
Esty	Lieu, Ted	Roybal-Allard
Farenthold	Lipinski	Royce
Farr	LoBiondo	Rush
Fattah	Loeb	Russell
Fincher	Loeb	Ryan (OH)
Fitzpatrick	Love	Ryan (WI)
Fleischmann	Lowenthal	Sanchez, Loretta
Flores	Lowey	Sanford
Forbes	Lucas	Sarbanes
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Foster	Lynch	Schakowsky
Frankel (FL)	MacArthur	Schrader
Frelinghuysen	Maloney,	Schweikert
Gabbard	Carolyn	Scott (VA)
Garamendi	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Garrett	Marino	Scott, David
Gibbs	Matsui	Serrano
Gibson	McCarthy	Sessions
Goodlatte	McCaul	Sewell (AL)
Granger	McClintock	Sherman
Graves (GA)	McCollum	Shimkus
Graves (LA)	McDermott	Shuster
Graves (MO)	McGovern	Simpson
Grayson	McHenry	Sires
Green, Al	McKinley	Slaughter
Guinta	McMorris	Smith (MO)
Guthrie	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Hahn	McNerney	Smith (NJ)
Hanna	Meadows	Smith (TX)
Hardy	Meehan	Smith (WA)
Harper	Meeks	Speier
Hartzler	Meng	Stefanik
Hastings	Mica	Stewart
Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)	Stivers
Heck (WA)	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
Hensarling	Moolenaar	Swalwell (CA)
Herrera Beutler	Moore	Takai
Hice, Jody B.	Moulton	Takano
Higgins	Mullin	Thompson (MS)
Himes	Mulvaney	Thornberry
Hinojosa	Murphy (PA)	Tiberi
Hoyer	Nadler	Tipton
Huffman	Napolitano	Tonko
Huelskamp	Neal	Torres
Labrador	Neugebauer	Trott
Lawrence	Noem	Tsongas
Long	Nolan	Turner
Loudermilk	Nugent	Nunes
Lujan Grisham	Israel	O'Rourke
(NM)	Issa	Olson
Luján, Ben Ray	Jackson Lee	Palazzo
(NM)	Jeffries	Palmer
Lummis	Jenkins (WV)	Pascrell
Maloney, Sean	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen
Massie	Johnson (OH)	Payne
McSally	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce
Messer	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi
Mooney (WV)	Jolly	Perlmutter
Murphy (FL)	Joyce	Peters
Newhouse	Kaptur	Peterson
Norcross	Katko	Pittenger
Pallone	Keating	Pitts
	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
	Kelly (MS)	Poe (TX)
	Kelly (PA)	Posey
	Kennedy	Price, Tom
	Kildee	Kilmer
	Cramer	Kind
	Crawford	King (NY)
	Crenshaw	Reichert
	Crowley	Reed
	Cuellar	Renacci
	Culberson	Ribble
	Cummings	Rice (NY)
	Curbelo (FL)	Rice (SC)
	Davis (CA)	Richmond
	Davis, Danny	Rigell
	DeGette	Lamborn
	Delaney	Lance
	DeLauro	Langevin
	DelBene	Larsen (WA)
	Denham	Larsen (CT)
	Dent	Latta
	DeSaulnier	
	DesJarlais	
	Deutch	
	Diaz-Balart	
	Dingell	
	Doggett	
	Dold	
	Donovan	
	Doyle, Michael	
	F.	
	Duckworth	
	Duffy	
	Duncan (TN)	
	Edwards	

NOT VOTING—5

Clawson (FL) Gowdy Thompson (CA)
 Ellison Gutiérrez

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 265, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

AYES—165

Adams	Garrett	Nolan
Amash	Gibson	Norcross
Bass	Gosar	Pallone
Beatty	Grayson	Pascrell
Becerra	Grijalva	Payne
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hahn	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Harris	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Hastings	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Honda	Quigley
Capps	Hoyer	Rangel
Capuano	Huelskamp	Rice (NY)
Cardenas	Israel	Richmond
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rohrabacher
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Jenkins (KS)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Jordan	Salmon
Cicilline	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	T.
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kildee	Sanford
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Connolly	Kuster	Schrader
Conyers	Labrador	Schweikert
Crowley	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
DeFazio	Lee	Sherman
DeGette	Levin	Sires
Delaney	Lewis	Slaughter
DelLauro	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
DelBene	Lofgren	Takai
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Takano
Deutch	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Titus
Doggett	(NM)	Tonko
Doyle, Michael	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
F.	(NM)	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Massie	Vargas
Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Veasey
Edwards	McDermott	Velázquez
Ellison	McGovern	Visclosky
Engel	McNerney	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meeks	Schultz
Esty	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Mooney (WV)	Welch
Fattah	Mulvaney	Wenstrup
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Westerman
Fudge	Nadler	Whitfield
Gabbard	Napolitano	Williams
Gallego	Neal	Wilson (SC)
		Wittman
		Womack
		Woodall
		Yarmuth
		Yoder
		Yoho
		Young (AK)
		Young (IA)
		Young (IN)
		Zeldin
		Zinke

NOES—265

Abraham	Barr	Black
Aderholt	Barton	Blackburn
Aguilar	Benishek	Blum
Allen	Bera	Bost
Amodei	Bilirakis	Boustany
Ashford	Bishop (GA)	Boyle, Brendan
Babin	Bishop (MI)	F.
Barletta	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)

□ 1414

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cleaver
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes

NOT VOTING—3

Clawson (FL) Gowdy Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1417

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 51, noes 378,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

AYES—51

Barletta
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Collins (GA)
Cramer
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Fleming
Gallego
Garrett
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Griffith
Grijalva

NOES—378

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot

Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rouzer
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise

NOT VOTING—4

Clawson (FL) Hill
Gowdy Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1421

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 352
Gosar No. 2 DoD App's I was detained in a
constituent meeting. Had I been present, I
would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 262, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

AYES—166

Adams	Foxx	Murphy (FL)
Amash	Frankel (FL)	Nadler
Ashford	Fudge	Napolitano
Bass	Gabbard	Neal
Beatty	Gallego	Nolan
Becerra	Garrett	Norcross
Bera	Gibson	O'Rourke
Beyer	Grayson	Pallone
Bishop (UT)	Green, Al	Payne
Blum	Griffith	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Perry
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Polis
Butterfield	Honda	Price (NC)
Capps	Hoyer	Quigley
Capuano	Huelskamp	Rangel
Cárdenas	Hunter	Rice (NY)
Carney	Israel	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clay	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kind	Schiff
Connolly	Labrador	Schweikert
Conyers	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lee	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Levin	Sires
DeFazio	Lewis	Slaughter
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Delaney	Lofgren	Speier
DeLauro	Lowe	Takai
DelBene	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Takano
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Carolyn	Tonko
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Doggett	McClintock	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCollum	Vargas
Duncan (TN)	McDermott	Veasey
Edwards	McGovern	Velázquez
Ellison	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Engel	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Eshoo	Farr	Welch
Farr	Fattah	Wilson (FL)
Fattah	Foster	Young (IA)
Foster	Moulton	

NOES—262

Abraham	Barton	Boustany
Aderholt	Benishek	Brady (TX)
Aguilar	Bilirakis	Brat
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Bridenstine
Amodei	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (AL)
Babin	Black	Brooks (IN)
Barletta	Blackburn	Buchanan
Barr	Boat	Buck

Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Ratcliffe
Burgess	Hultgren	Reed
Bustos	Hurd (TX)	Reichert
Byrne	Hurt (VA)	Renacci
Calvert	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (SC)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Castor (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Chabot	Jolly	Roe (TN)
Chaffetz	Jones	Rogers (AL)
Coffman	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Katko	Rokita
Collins (GA)	Keating	Rooney (FL)
Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Cook	King (IA)	Ross
Cooper	King (NY)	Rothfus
Costa	Kinzinger (IL)	Rouzer
Costello (PA)	Kirkpatrick	Royce
Courtney	Kline	Russell
Cramer	Knight	Ryan (WI)
Crawford	LaMalfa	Salmon
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Sanford
Cuellar	Lance	Scalise
Culberson	Latta	Schrader
Curbelo (FL)	Lawrence	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner
Denham	LoBiondo	Sessions
Dent	Loeback	Shimkus
DeSantis	Long	Shuster
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Love	Sinema
Dold	Lowenthal	Smith (MO)
Donovan	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Doyle, Michael F.	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Duffy	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Smith (TX)
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Stefanik
Ellmers (NC)	Lynch	Stewart
Emmer (MN)	MacArthur	Stivers
Esty	Marchant	Stutzman
Farenthold	Marino	Swalwell (CA)
Fincher	Massie	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	Matsui	Thornberry
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Tiberi
Fleming	McCauley	Tipton
Flores	McHenry	Titus
Forbes	McKinley	Torres
Fortenberry	McMorris	Trott
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Turner
Frelinghuysen	McSally	Upton
Garamendi	Meadows	Valadao
Gibbs	Meehan	Vela
Gohmert	Messer	Visclosky
Goodlatte	Mica	Wagner
Gosar	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Graham	Miller (MI)	Walden
Granger	Moolenaar	Walker
Graves (GA)	Mooney (WV)	Walorski
Graves (LA)	Mullin	Walters, Mimi
Graves (MO)	Mulvaney	Walz
Green, Gene	Murphy (PA)	Wasserman
Grothman	Neugebauer	Schultz
Guinta	Newhouse	Weber (TX)
Guthrie	Noem	Webster (FL)
Hahn	Nugent	Wenstrup
Hanna	Nunes	Westerman
Hardy	Olson	Westmoreland
Harper	Palazzo	Whitfield
Harris	Palmer	Williams
Hartzler	Pascrell	Wilson (SC)
Heck (NV)	Paulsen	Wittman
Hensarling	Pearce	Womack
Herrera Beutler	Peters	Woodall
Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger	Yarmuth
Hill	Pitts	Yoder
Himes	Poe (TX)	Yoho
Holding	Poliquin	Young (AK)
Hudson	Pompeo	Young (IN)
Huffman	Posey	Zeldin
	Price, Tom	Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

Clawson (FL)	Jordan	Thompson (CA)
Growdy	Scott, David	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1424

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 242, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

AYES—187

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

NOES—242

Abraham	Babin	Bilirakis
Aderholt	Barletta	Bishop (MI)
Allen	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Amash	Barton	Black
Amodei	Benishek	Blackburn

Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling

Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCauley
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
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)

Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Cramer
Crawford
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta

postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 297, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

AYES—133

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barietta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Collins (GA)
King (IA)
Long
Loudermilk
Cramer
Crawford
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marino
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Nunes
Olson
Palmer

Guthrie
Harper
Pitts
Hensarling
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rokita
Rothfus
Rouzer
Salmon
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Thompson (PA)

Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis

Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Miller (FL)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

NOT VOTING—3
Clawson (FL)
Gowdy
Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1431

Ms. PELOSI and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr.

NOT VOTING—4

Palazzo
Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1427

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) on which further proceedings were

Adams
Aguiar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownlee (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas

NOES—297

Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar

Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr

MASSIE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 255, noes 174, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

AYES—255

Adams Eshoo Love
 Aguilar Esty Lowenthal
 Amash Farenthold Lowey
 Amodei Farr Lujan Grisham
 Ashford Fattah (NM)
 Babin Fitzpatrick Lujan, Ben Ray
 Barton Fleischmann (NM)
 Bass Fleming Lynch
 Beatty Fortenberry Maloney,
 Becerra Foxx Carolyn
 Beyer Franks (AZ) Maloney, Sean
 Bilirakis Fudge Massie
 Bishop (GA) Gabbard Matsui
 Bishop (UT) Gallego McClintock
 Black Gibbs McCollum
 Blackburn Gibson McDermott
 Blum Gohmert McGovern
 Blumenauer Gosar McNerney
 Bonamici Graves (GA) Meadows
 Boyle, Brendan Graves (LA) Meeks
 F. Grayson Meng
 Brady (PA) Green, Al Messer
 Brat Green, Gene Mica
 Bridenstine Griffith Mooney (WV)
 Brooks (AL) Grijalva Moore
 Buchanan Grothman Mulvaney
 Buck Guinta Nadler
 Burgess Guthrie Napolitano
 Bustos Gutiérrez Neal
 Butterfield Hahn Neugebauer
 Byrne Harris Nolan
 Capus Heck (WA) Norcross
 Capuano Hensarling Nugent
 Cárdenas Herrera Beutler O'Rourke
 Carter (GA) Hice, Jody B. Olson
 Cartwright Higgins Pallone
 Castro (TX) Hinojosa Payne
 Chabot Honda Pelosi
 Chu, Jody Hoyer Perlmutter
 Cicilline Hudson Perry
 Clark (MA) Huelskamp Peterson
 Clarke (NY) Huffman Pingree
 Clay Hultgren Pocan
 Cleaver Hunter Poe (TX)
 Clyburn Hurt (VA) Polis
 Cohen Issa Posey
 Collins (GA) Jackson Lee Price (NC)
 Connolly Jeffries Price, Tom
 Conyers Jenkins (KS) Rangel
 Courtney Jenkins (WV) Ratcliffe
 Cramer Johnson (GA) Renacci
 Crowley Johnson, Sam Ribble
 Cuellar Jones Rice (SC)
 Cummings Jordan Richmond
 Curbelo (FL) Kelly (IL) Roe (TN)
 Davis (CA) Kelly (MS) Rohrabacher
 DeFazio Kildee Rokita
 DeGette Kilmer Ross
 DeLauro Kind Rothfus
 DelBene Kirkpatrick Roybal-Allard
 DeSantis Kuster Ruiz
 DeSaulnier Labrador Rush
 DesJarlais LaMalfa Ryan (OH)
 Deutch Lamborn Salmon
 Dingell Lance Sánchez, Linda
 Doggett Larsen (WA) T.
 Doyle, Michael Larson (CT) Sanchez, Loretta
 F. Latta Sanford
 Duffy Lawrence Sarbanes
 Duncan (SC) Levin Schakowsky
 Duncan (TN) Lewis Schrader
 Edwards Lieu, Ted Schweikert
 Ellison Loeb sack Scott (VA)
 Emmer (MN) Lofgren Scott, David
 Engel Loudermilk Sensenbrenner

Serrano Tipton
 Sessions Titus
 Sires Tomko
 Slaughter Tsongas
 Smith (NJ) Van Hollen
 Smith (TX) Vargas
 Smith (WA) Veasey
 Stutzman Vela
 Takai Velázquez
 Takano Wagner
 Thompson (MS) Walberg
 Thompson (PA) Walke

Walz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Weber (TX)
 Welch
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)

NOES—174

Abraham Hastings
 Aderholt Heck (NV)
 Allen Hill
 Barletta Himes
 Barr Holding
 Benishek Huizenga (MI)
 Bera Hurd (TX)
 Bishop (MI) Israel
 Bost Johnson (OH)
 Boustany Johnson, E. B.
 Brady (TX) Jolly
 Brooks (IN) Joyce
 Brown (FL) Katko
 Brownley (CA) Keating
 Bucshon Kelly (PA)
 Calvert Kennedy
 Carney King (IA)
 Carson (IN) King (NY)
 Carter (TX) Kinzinger (IL)
 Castor (FL) Castor
 Chaffetz Knight
 Coffman Langevin
 Cole Lee
 Collins (NY) Lipinski
 Comstock LoBiondo
 Conaway Long
 Cook Lucas
 Cooper Luetkemeyer
 Costa Lummis
 Costello (PA) MacArthur
 Crawford Marchant
 Crenshaw Marino
 Culberson McCarthy
 Davis, Danny McCaul
 Davis, Rodney McHenry
 Delaney McKinley
 Denham McMorris
 Dent Rodgers
 Diaz-Balart McSally
 Dold Meehan
 Donovan Miller (FL)
 Duckworth Miller (MI)
 Ellmers (NC) Moolenaar
 Fincher Moulton
 Flores Mullin
 Forbes Murphy (FL)
 Foster Murphy (PA)
 Frankel (FL) Newhouse
 Frelinghuysen Noem
 Garamendi Nunes
 Garrett Palazzo
 Goodlatte Palmer
 Graham Pascarell
 Granger Paulsen
 Graves (MO) Pearce
 Hanna Peters
 Hardy Pittenger
 Harper Pitts
 Hartzler Poliquin

Pompeo
 Quigley
 Reed
 Reichert
 Rice (NY)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Ruppersberger
 Russell
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Schiff
 Scott, Austin
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Speier
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Swalwell (CA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Torres
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Visclosky
 Walden
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

NOT VOTING—4

Clawson (FL) Kaptur
 Gowdy Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1435

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 303, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MOULTON. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Moulton moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2685 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In the "Operation and Maintenance, Army" account, on page 7, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

In the "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" account, on page 9, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,000,000) (increased by \$2,000,000)".

In the "Defense Health Program" account, on page 36, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

In the "Defense Health Program" account, on page 36, line 9, after the dollar amount relating to research, development, test and evaluation, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

In the "Defense Health Program" account, on page 36, line 20, after the dollar amount relating to the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is simple. First, it will add \$2 million to the Army Threat Integration Center to protect our troops and their families from terrorist attacks.

ISIS, al Qaeda, and other terrorist groups are directly threatening Americans, our troops, and our allies abroad every single day. In fact, a group related to ISIS recently posted the photos and addresses of about 100 hundred U.S. troops online so that, in their words, “our brothers residing in America can deal with you.”

Our military families have also been threatened with attacks. We can't stand idly by; we must act, and this additional funding will help.

The amendment also adds \$2 million for the Yellow Ribbon reintegration program to help Active Duty and National Guard troops. As a veteran myself, I know just how difficult the reintegration process can be. In fact, I am in regular contact with many of the marines from my platoon, and we talk about this every day.

These men and women have put their lives on the line for our country and our freedom. We owe it to them to provide them with the resources they need both on and off the battlefield.

Lastly, this amendment adds \$5 million for Joint Warfighter Medical Research, which provides the latest cutting-edge techniques to save injured troops on the battlefield.

The men and women who fight on our behalf should know that we have their backs at the most difficult times.

These initiatives are fully paid for with a reasonable and commonsense reduction in funding for Defense Media Activity, which provides magazines and movies for our military.

I ask my colleagues: Is it more important to fund the fight against ISIS or to fund government-sponsored Scooby Doo? After all, if the troops really want to watch it, they can get their cartoons on their smartphones anyway.

Rarely in this Chamber do we have a choice that is so clear. Let's take a small step to improve this bill for our military families and for our troops.

I urge Members to vote “yes” on this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Before speaking on the motion to recommit, Mr. VISCLOSKY and I would like to thank our consummate professional staff that put this bill together for all of us, headed up by our clerk, Rob Blair; Tim Prince; Paul Terry; Walter Hearne; B.G. Wright; Brooke Boyer; Adrienne Ramsey; Megan Milam; Collin Lee; Cornell Teague; and Sherry Young; of my staff, Nancy Fox, Steve Wilson, and Katie Hazlett; minority clerks Becky Leggieri and Taunja Berquam; and from Mr. VISCLOSKY's staff, Joe DeVooght.

Mr. Chairman, over the years, Members of Congress have agreed that the Defense Appropriations bill is no place

for partisan politics. Our national security is far too important.

This week, the leadership of the other party has decided to throw that tradition out the window, and their timing couldn't be more unfortunate.

As we gather here this afternoon, over 200,000 men and women in uniform do the hard work of freedom across the globe—in Afghanistan, Iraq, the Sinai, Eastern Europe, along the DMZ, and other faraway places. These members of our Armed Forces and their comrades who serve here at home and their families all deserve our admiration and untiring gratitude.

This bipartisan bill before you delivers for them. I urge a “no” vote on the motion to recommit and “yes” on final passage of this bipartisan bill that recognizes and honors their service.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 240, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

AYES—186

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

Valadao Wenstrup Yoder
 Wagner Westerman Yoho
 Walberg Westmoreland Yoho (AK)
 Walden Whitfield Young (IA)
 Walker Williams Young (IN)
 Walorski Wilson (SC) Zeldin
 Walters, Mimi Wittman
 Weber (TX) Womack
 Webster (FL) Woodall

NOT VOTING—7

Clawson (FL) Grothman Thompson (CA)
 Duffy Hice, Jody B.
 Gowdy Kaptur

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1451

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 149, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

YEAS—278

Abraham Denham Huizenga (MI)
 Aderholt Dent Hultgren
 Aguilar DeSantis Hunter
 Allen DesJarlais Hurd (TX)
 Amodei Diaz-Balart Hurt (VA)
 Ashford Dold Issa
 Babin Donovan Jenkins (KS)
 Barletta Duckworth Jenkins (WV)
 Barr Duffy Johnson (OH)
 Barton Duncan (SC) Johnson, Sam
 Benishek Ellmers (NC) Jolly
 Bera Emmer (MN) Jordan
 Bilirakis Esty Joyce
 Bishop (GA) Farenthold Kelly (MS)
 Bishop (MI) Fincher Kelly (PA)
 Bishop (UT) Fitzpatrick Kilmer
 Black Fleischmann King (IA)
 Blackburn Fleming King (NY)
 Blum Flores Kinzinger (IL)
 Bost Forbes Kirkpatrick
 Boustany Fortenberry Kline
 Brady (TX) Foster Knight
 Brat Foxx Kuster
 Bridenstine Franks (AZ) LaMalfa
 Brooks (AL) Frelinghuysen Lamborn
 Brooks (IN) Gabbard Lance
 Brownley (CA) Garrett Langevin
 Buchanan Gibbs Larson (CT)
 Buck Gibson Latta
 Bucshon Gohmert Lipinski
 Burgess Goodlatte LoBiondo
 Bustos Gosar Long
 Byrne Graham Loudermilk
 Calvert Granger Love
 Carter (GA) Graves (GA) Lucas
 Carter (TX) Graves (LA) Luetkemeyer
 Chabot Graves (MO) Lujan Grisham
 Chaffetz Green, Gene (NM)
 Cole Griffith Lummis
 Collins (GA) Guinta MacArthur
 Collins (NY) Guthrie Maloney, Sean
 Comstock Hanna Marchant
 Conaway Hardy Marino
 Cook Harper Massie
 Cooper Harris McCarthy
 Costa Hartzler McCaul
 Costello (PA) Heck (NV) McClintock
 Courtney Heck (WA) McHenry
 Cramer Hensarling McKinley
 Crawford Herrera Beutler McMorris
 Crenshaw Hice, Jody B. Rodgers
 Cuellar Hill McNerney
 Culberson Himes McSally
 Curbelo (FL) Holding Meadows
 Davis, Rodney Hudson Meehan
 Delaney Huelskamp Messer

Mica Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Mooneyaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nolan
 Norcross
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)

NAYS—149

Adams Frankel (FL)
 Amash Fudge
 Bass Gallego
 Beatty Garamendi
 Becerra Grayson
 Beyer Green, Al
 Blumenauer Grijalva
 Bonamici Gutierrez
 Boyle, Brendan Hahn
 F. Hastings
 Brady (PA) Higgins
 Brown (FL) Hinojosa
 Butterfield Honda
 Capps Hoyer
 Capuano Huffman
 Cardenas Israel
 Carney Jackson Lee
 Carson (IN) Jeffries
 Cartwright Johnson (GA)
 Castor (FL) Johnson, E. B.
 Castro (TX) Jones
 Chu, Judy Kaptur
 Cicilline Keating
 Clark (MA) Kelly (IL)
 Clarke (NY) Kennedy
 Clay Kildee
 Kind Kind
 Labrador Labrador (WA)
 Larsen (WA) Lawrence
 Connolly Lee
 Conyers Conyers
 Crowley Levin
 Cummings Lewis
 Davis (CA) Lieu, Ted
 Davis, Danny Loebsock
 DeFazio Lofgren
 DeGette Lowenthal
 DeLauro Lowey
 DeBene Lujan, Ben Ray
 DeSaulnier (NM)
 Deutch Lynch
 Dingell Maloney,
 Doggett Carolyn
 Doyle, Michael Matsui
 F. McCollum
 Duncan (TN) McDermott
 Edwards McGovern
 Ellison Meeks
 Engel Meng
 Eshoo Moore
 Farr Moulton
 Fattah Nadler

NOT VOTING—6

Clawson (FL) Gowdy Katko
 Coffman Grothman Thompson (CA)

Takai Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Veasey
 Vela
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Walz
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

□ 1459

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 358, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on passage of H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, I would have voted “yes” had I been present for the final roll (Roll no. 358).

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
 Washington, DC, June 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
 The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, 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 June 11, 2015 at 11:26 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 253.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1314, ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 644, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 305 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 305

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The

question of adoption of the motion shall be divided as follows: first, concurring in section 212 of the Senate amendment; second, concurring in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment; and third, concurring in the matter preceding title II of the Senate amendment. The portion of the divided question on concurring in section 212 of the Senate amendment shall be considered as adopted. The Chair shall first put the question on the portion of the divided question on concurring in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment. If any portion of the divided question fails of adoption, then the House shall be considered to have made no disposition of the Senate amendment.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House: (1) concur in the Senate amendment to the title; and (2) concur in the Senate amendment to the text with the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution modified by the amendment printed in part B of that report. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question. If the motion is adopted, then it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 644 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very dear friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defense of Ronald Reagan Republican free trade principles and in support of trade promotion authority, which is known as TPA.

Since the days of President Ronald Reagan, Republicans have supported free trade because we know that when America competes, America wins. TPA is a vital piece of our free trade agenda because it creates the process that we need to secure trade agreements that

grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and lower prices for American consumers.

For America to continue to determine the rules of the global economy, we need to lead by crafting free trade agreements, and thus, the House is here today to provide to the President the parameters under which he or she should negotiate a trade promotion authority.

Free trade means more good-paying American jobs. Free trade means that American workers make American products at American businesses to be sold all across the globe. More than 38 million American jobs are tied to trade, and these jobs pay well. In fact, trade-related jobs, on average, pay 18 percent more than jobs that are not trade related.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is here today with Ronald Reagan watching from Heaven down on us, to say that we are continuing what he really began, and that is a process of American exceptionalism around the world.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, shortly after midnight Tuesday night, the Rules Committee learned we would consider the Senate's package of three sweeping trade bills. We convened mere hours later and considered hundreds of pages of new text rewriting our trade laws and the rules of the House.

Part of that package includes what is called fast track, a procedure that has outlived its purpose and circumvents congressional authority because it does not allow for committee debate or for the Members to be able to amend it or change it, just to vote up or down—at least that is what happened over here in the House.

It silences the debates of the Members of the Chamber, and by doing that, the Americans who send us here don't have a voice. We are being asked to push this Trans-Pacific Partnership through by using fast track, and what is more, we are being asked to push fast track through with a closed rule.

Now, we have been very concerned about what is in this fast track. As you know, we really aren't allowed to know. We are only allowed to vote up or down on the trade bill itself, once fast track is passed.

I realized how awful it was for us here; if we wanted to go see it, we had to take someone with us with a security clearance, but we would not be allowed to talk about it.

I learned of something this morning that is even worse, an article of The New York Times about the Australian Government and the members of Parliament there who say that, if they go down and read the trade bill, they have to sign an oath that they will not speak of it for 4 years.

Now, that asks the question: Who runs these democracies, the Represent-

atives of the people of the United States or the corporate giants who write the trade bills that we are not able to see?

It is pretty clear who runs it here because, from what we have heard, that was leaked out through WikiLeaks, is that major parts of this bill have been negotiated by Big Pharma, the pharmaceutical industries of America, and the financial system. Neither one of those have shown any aptitude to try to put the members of the public first.

Australia is so concerned about the fact that pharma is asking for 12 more years' extension on their patents that they are very much afraid it will destroy their healthcare system.

More and more people are finding out simply by the leaks of what is in this bill, and so far, according to the polls, nobody much likes it.

Instead of the weeks that we could have had a transparent debate about a bill we had seen and a bill that we know, all we do is roll what happened in the Rules Committee yesterday. Yesterday, no Member of the Rules Committee or any Member of the House who came before it was allowed to have amendments approved.

Now, the Senate did; the Senate allowed amendments to change the bills considerably, but not us. Amendments were offered in the Rules Committee to provide for transparency so that we will know what these things are all about.

To change the investor's state, what we need to really bear down on—and the Australians are also aware of—is that disputes from any of the 12 countries in this trade agreement, if they do not approve of or believe they are losing money because of our Clean Air Act or our Clean Water Act, they can go to the three-person tribunal of corporate lawyers and act against us.

We know that that is a concern in this Congress because just yesterday, they voted away the country of origin labeling because they were concerned about the WTO.

As I pointed out, we had those amendments. We also had one amendment on currency manipulation, which is a major concern. We lose lots of jobs and lots of money because of currency manipulation, and we simply allow it to happen.

We will not do anything—everybody says, if that should be in this bill at all, that the President would veto it—so the American public, once again, those of us standing here trying to take care of them, are not going to be able to do it because we only know by word of mouth or what we have been able to read in the newspapers what is in there.

Let me tell you what is in the rule. That is a very important piece. Most of the discussion in the House has been around what we call the pay-for part of the trade bill, which is called trade adjustment allowance. That is supposed to take care of all the people who are laid off, who lose their jobs. The fact

that we have asked for such a large number indicates to me that they expect an awful lot of jobs lost in this country.

So how the TAA was paid for, as it came from the Senate, was with a \$700 million cut in Medicare. NANCY PELOSI has driven mightily, along with JOHN BOEHNER, to change those cuts that will be paid for with the TAA.

I need to make it very clear, and I want everybody to understand that the bill we voted on this morning, the African growth bill, which contains the new pay-fors other than Medicare, are not valid until after the Senate acts on that bill. If tomorrow on the floor, the trade adjustment allowance and the fast track authority pass, they will go to the Senate, with the pay-fors coming from Medicare.

I think it is very important that we make that point because many of the people that serve with us here are confused about exactly where that is coming from.

Let me repeat that. The pay-fors that substitute from the use of Medicare to pay for trade adjustment allowance will not be valid until after there is Senate action, if or when that takes place.

We were told that the Speaker said over in the Senate that he would do this under unanimous consent, but we have also been told that unanimous consent will not be given.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the advocates of the fast track and TPP are telling us that this is going to be a wonderful trade deal.

We know that it is not going to create jobs because none of them have. Those of us in upstate New York, after NAFTA, we were told we were going to get at least 250,000 new jobs; instead, as the Speaker probably knows, we lost a great deal.

If we, as Members of Congress, wanted to view the deal, we could not talk about it; and that, by itself, should be enough to have us not do it.

□ 1515

In a seminal sociological and political discussion of our early American democracy, "Democracy in America," Alexis de Tocqueville said of our Nation in 1835: "The surface of American society is covered with a layer of democratic paint. But from time to time, one can see the old aristocratic colors breaking through."

This is one of those times, Mr. Speaker, because this bill, this trade bill that affects every person in the United States—and will for maybe a generation to come—is not being written by the Members of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, but in a closed, backroom deal and, as we are told, by major corporations in the United States to benefit themselves. That certainly appears to be what we are going to get.

By giving away the role of Congress in setting the trade policies, we give away our ability to safeguard Amer-

ica's jobs and, most importantly again, as I pointed out, the American laws meant to protect the citizens we represent, such as the Clean Water Act. I have never seen in my years of Congress a trade bill come out of this Congress that benefited either the American manufacturer or the American worker. This one is the same.

Any lawmaker thinking about voting for another job-killing trade agreement should take a serious look at NAFTA and at our growing trade deficit with South Korea and think about whether they want to be responsible for shipping their constituents' jobs overseas.

Now, we know this bill has been modeled after the failed policies that have shuttered store windows and closed factories all across the Nation. That is the legacy, ladies and gentlemen, of free trade. What we ought to demand in our trading bills is fair trade. America should not be the supplier of jobs to bolster the rest of world and improve their economies at the cost of ours.

From food safety, clean air, and labor standards to environmental protections, this trade deal would impact every facet of our daily lives. Ninety percent of the seafood now that is consumed by Americans is imported. Less than 3 percent of it is inspected. Tons of it have been sent back just from that small amount being inspected.

We will not be able to interfere with them coming in here under the investor-state dispute settlement or under this free trade act.

I urge my colleague to vote "no" on the rule and carefully, carefully consider the trade package before us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman originally, I believe, is from Kentucky, and she will recognize when I tell this awesome story about how important a free trade agreement is.

A couple of years ago, we did a free trade agreement with the country of Korea. Within a year, Mr. Speaker, as a result of that trade agreement, the number one selling car in Korea came from Georgetown, Kentucky. It is a Toyota Camry made in the United States. The Koreans love it, a Kentucky-made product.

Mr. Speaker, if we didn't have a free trade agreement with Korea, the people in Georgetown, Kentucky, couldn't claim to be the number one car in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the young gentleman from Auburn, Washington (Mr. REICHERT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today in support of today's rule, which will allow us to proceed in consideration of trade promotion authority, trade adjustment assistance, and customs legislation.

Passage of trade promotion authority is absolutely critical to our economic growth and global leadership. Without TPA, we will not be able to bring home

the benefits of a high-standard trade agreement.

Now, what are the benefits of high-standard trade agreements? Job creation, selling American products across this globe to 96 percent of the market, which exists outside of this country. Selling American, that is what we want to do.

And, by the way, we not only create jobs, but we create jobs that are higher paid wages, which we are all trying to struggle with across this country in raising the minimum wage. We can do that in this trade adjustment and trade promotion authority.

This is counter to exactly what communities across the Nation need right now: more opportunities, more good paying jobs; and that leads to a promising future for our families, for our children, to better-paying, high-tech jobs and manufacturing jobs across this country.

I am proud to be the House sponsor of legislation to renew trade adjustment assistance because I understand the necessity of TAA.

Now, not only is this a great trade initiative here, but we are also taking into consideration, as we move ahead in this global economy, that there may be people who do have opportunities to look at other jobs; and this TAA bill provides training and education for people to have and gain better jobs, higher paying jobs. So I would encourage my colleagues to vote for this rule in support of TPA, TAA, and the customs legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute because I do so appreciate my friend, Mr. SESSIONS, giving us a good Kentucky story. I need to change that story just a little bit. That factory has been in Georgetown for at least three decades. It is Toyota, which is Japanese.

All of South Korea has only 26 car dealers in the country that will sell an American car. Of course, we buy Japanese cars that are made here, but they don't buy ours in Japan. I think about 2 years ago we had only sold 8,000 American cars in Japan for that entire year, and I would imagine we sell that many Japanese cars in the United States on a daily basis.

So I appreciate the story. Georgetown, I know, would love to be mentioned, but we have got to get it right.

Now I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because America's middle class and our workers have been under economic attack. I rise to voice my opposition to the very restrictive process being used to shove these job outsourcing trade deals through Congress.

The Republican leadership has denied our House any amendment, even on currency manipulation, on legislation that is sure to impact every single American, turning our oversight role into little more than a rubberstamp. This makes a mockery of the House's

clear, constitutional authority on trade and commerce.

Worse still, this limitation is being pursued because Republican leaders simply do not want to go to conference with the Senate. This belies every American, every Member their right to be represented and have a voice in this process.

Hundreds, however, of multinational corporations and lobbyists, the 1 percent, helped to write, amend, and draft the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, line by line.

But today, years into the process and with negotiation in the final stages, Members of Congress were only recently given our first access. To read it, you have to go to a secure room, deep in the Visitor Center. We are supervised. Any notes we take are confiscated, and we can't discuss what we find with anyone unless they have top secret clearance.

The trade deal is a secret deal because they want to fast-track it through Congress, hoping Congress really won't understand what is in it. And I find it hard to imagine a more dangerous or irresponsible approach than fast-tracking another trade deal through Congress.

TPA, the authority to fast track, is a gateway to the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Both will further harm workers and communities to a faster global race to the bottom, with more outsourcing of jobs, more lower wages, more dropping benefits, more lower standards for worker safety, compensation, and environment. We have seen that since NAFTA passed 30 years ago.

For decades, I have fought against destructive trade deals that were brought down on our Nation's workers and communities.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Over this period of time, every time one of these so-called free trade deals is signed, America moves into deeper and deeper trade deficit, deeper and deeper red ink, as more of our jobs get shipped abroad.

I remember standing at the corner of Ohio and Michigan Avenues in Matamoros, Mexico, and looking at the TRICO windshield factory that was moved from the State of New York down there, and Parker Seals. It almost seemed like a movie set but for one thing, it was real.

Last year alone, our trade deficit cost us 20 percent of our GDP. Is anybody here paying attention or are we all a part of the 1 percent and forget about the 99 percent who have had to bear the brunt of this terrible, terrible outsourcing of jobs?

Average American wages across my region have dropped by \$7,000. This trade deficit didn't happen by accident. Some people got filthy rich off of it.

This is a time for America to say, "No more. No more. We are going to do it right. We are going to create trade

deals that create jobs in our country, create a stronger middle class, raise wages, improve the environment, here and abroad. No more taking it out of the hide of America's workers."

We are here because we stand on their shoulders. Vote "no" on this rule and "no" on TAA and "no" on TPP.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you know, I love the fervency of our colleagues who come down here and argue Japan is the problem. You can't talk about the trade agreement that we have with Korea where it works—Japan, Japan, Japan.

Well, good gosh, this is about getting a trade deal with what is called TPP, of which Japan would be included. This is a deal where my colleagues come down and don't like our trade deficits, but the bottom line is that the United States has a trade surplus with its 20 free trade partners.

So we are trying to take people from nontrade agreement, where we run a deficit and they close their market, to a trade deal where we run a surplus where people want to buy American-made products. If they will listen, we have got a good deal for them today. And one of those good deals, Mr. Speaker, is agriculture, so that our men and women engaged in agriculture can sell their products around the world.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Midland, Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, and I especially want to commend Chairman RYAN and his colleagues on Ways and Means for their hard work in bringing us the underlying legislation.

Everyone in the room knows that America's farmers and ranchers are the most productive in the world. They have continuously proven their ability to meet rapidly growing and ever-changing demands here at home, and their reach stretches well beyond the shores of America. In fact, exports now account for almost one-third of total U.S. farm income. In the case of commodities like cotton, tree nuts, rice, and wheat, over one-half the total production is exported.

In 2014 alone, U.S. agricultural exports set a record \$152.5 billion, highlighting the growing demand for quality food and fiber around the world. As was noted in a recent hearing before the House Agriculture Committee, the United States exported almost as much beef, pork, and poultry to the 20 nations with which we have trade agreements as they did the other 170-plus nations in the world.

Beyond the obvious benefits to producers, trade also helps support almost 1 million American jobs in production agriculture and in related sectors like food processing and transportation. As a result, it is crucial not only to American agriculture, but to the U.S. economy as a whole, to maintain and increase access to the world's 7 billion

consumers, 95 percent of whom live outside the shores of the United States. To obtain that access, it is imperative that we work to reduce and eliminate international barriers to trade so that our farmers and ranchers can compete on a level playing field in the global market.

With negotiations in the World Trade Organization languishing for the last 14 years, regional free trade agreements represent our best opportunity for expanding trade opportunities for U.S. agricultural. History has shown that trade promotion authority in one form or another has been vital in completing and implementing past agreements. In fact, Congress has granted TPA to every President since 1974, and the 114th Congress should be no exception.

TPA will provide our negotiators with the credibility necessary to conclude the most effective trade agreements possible by making it clear to the rest of the world that Congress and this administration are serious about this endeavor.

The legislation before us today empowers Congress to move the aggressive trade agenda. It includes the strongest measures, to date, for ensuring that this President sticks to the negotiating objectives laid down by Congress, including the unicameral ability to turn TPA off on an individual agreement. At the end of the day, it is Congress that will decide the fate of each agreement.

In conclusion, I am a strong proponent of free trade and the benefits it provides our Nation's producers and consumers. However, if we are not going to continue to expand American markets, other countries, often with lower standards, will step up to the plate and fill that demand. Markets are not won or regained easily after they have been lost, and billions around the globe still want America's quality food and fiber.

□ 1530

We can win over new markets, boost our economy, and meet these global demands first and foremost by showing that we are, in fact, a strong and reliable trading partner. We can make that happen by passing this rule and the underlying TPA agreement.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her tremendous leadership on so many issues.

I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. Our country has already lost too many good-paying American jobs because of past trade deals. We should be clear about what this rule would do. This rule is really a vote to extended Medicare sequestration and provides for no amendments in the fast track bill, Trade Adjustment Assistance, and the customs bill.

We have seen what happens when bad trade deals are passed without congressional oversight: American jobs shift

overseas—many come from communities of color; dangerous food makes its way to our meals; human rights are violated; labor standards are ignored; and the effects of climate change get worse.

The American people do deserve better. The American people deserve a trade policy that creates American jobs and an open process for passing trade deals that gives them a strong voice.

Passing this rule and passing fast track does neither. This is a bad deal for American workers. It is bad for American jobs. It needs to go back to the drawing board, a drawing board that is public and that gives the American people a voice in trade policy, not just big corporations and hedge fund managers.

Between 2001 and 2011, the growing trade deficit with China cost more than 2.7 million jobs. Nearly 1 million of these jobs, mind you, came from communities of color. After these workers lost their jobs, their situation went from bad to worse.

These workers saw their wages fall nearly 30 percent—or more than \$10,000 a year. The total economic cost of this job loss to these communities is more than \$10 billion. Now, that is \$10 billion each and every year.

We cannot allow another bad trade deal to shift millions more of American jobs overseas. We cannot allow another bad trade deal to strip billions from struggling communities. We cannot allow this rule or a flawed TAA or fast track to pass.

Make no mistake, I support trade. I have the honor of representing the Port of Oakland, and I understand the critical role that trade plays in the economy in my district, California and also in our country.

However, let me just say, trade only grows our economy. This bill is not fair; it is not open, and it is not transparent.

I have the honor of representing the Port of Oakland and I understand the critical role that trade plays in the economy of my district, California and our country.

However, trade only grows our economy when it's fair, open, transparent and creates jobs.

This bill—Fast Track—is not fair.

It's not open—

And it's not transparent.

So once again, I urge a “NO” vote on this Rule, a “NO” on the flawed TAA, and a “NO” on Fast Track.

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

Good gosh, Mr. Speaker, I was afraid she was in reference to ObamaCare, which is why we are losing American jobs all across this country.

The bottom line is that, where there is trade with other countries and we have a trade deal, America wins, and we get more jobs. As an example, 3 million jobs in the Lone Star State of Texas are related to trade, and jobs are growing nearly twice as fast as nontrade jobs. This is what is happening. It is the vibrancy of America.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Harrison Township, Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), chairman of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of this rule.

I come from southeast Michigan, which, of course, is the heart of American manufacturing. Michigan manufacturers, especially the Big Three domestic auto companies, have all had concerns for years about the unfair competitive disadvantage that they face by nations that manipulate their currency such as Japan, South Korea, and China.

It was very important to me that, as Congress moves forward with legislation to give trade promotion authority to this President and others, that the package must also include strong, new tools allowing America to fight back against those nations that unfairly manipulate their currency and those that harm American manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very thankful that Chairman RYAN and House leadership agreed to work with us to craft an approach which I believe is a strong step forward. For decades, administrations of both parties have refused to identify foreign currency manipulators or to take any action to stop it.

The manager's amendment, put forward by Chairman RYAN, that we worked with him to develop, gets very, very tough on currency manipulators. For the first time ever, Mr. Speaker, it puts in place a three-part test to define currency manipulation with specific guidance requiring nations that manipulate their currency to be named publicly.

Also, for the first time, the focus will be shifted from reporting and monitoring to actionable items and to steps that will show the impact of currency manipulation on the American economy, as well, Mr. Speaker, as requiring remedial action to be taken.

These tough steps will impact every Nation that we trade with, not just those that might be included in the TPP, but every Nation that we trade with, including South Korea and China, as I mentioned, Japan.

Certainly, while these are steps in the right direction, more needs to be done; absolutely, more needs to be done. Here in Congress, every Member of Congress continues to reserve the right to oppose any TPP agreement that does not meet the needs of the American economy and the American manufacturing industry.

With these changes that I have outlined here that are going to be in the manager's amendment, I support—and I am proud to support—this trade package that will provide an opportunity to drive our economy forward.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

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

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress, I worked for a while as an ironworker at the Quincy shipyard in Quincy, Massachusetts. I was a welder.

Unfortunately, because of bad trade policy, that shipyard closed down, and thousands of workers were laid off. Later on, I also worked at the General Motors facility in Framingham, Massachusetts, and the company decided to close that plant down, while they opened three new ones in Mexico. I have seen what lousy trade policy can do.

The fundamental problem with our trade policy is that it is negotiated in secret by multinational corporations who are basically hiring foreign labor at very low wages, move the jobs overseas, and then export the products back into the United States.

If you look at some of the minimum wages for the countries that we are dealing with in this trade agreement for Malaysia and Vietnam, it is less than \$1 an hour for the minimum wage in those countries, and they maintain those low wages so that they can attract business. It is a race to the bottom.

I do want to say that, as part of my job with the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I have had a chance to go to South Korea and Japan to see how our trade agreements have been working out there.

I was in South Korea for several days, and just on my own, with my staff, I looked for an American car for several days. We were in traffic a lot. South Korea is a booming industrial country, major highways. I saw hundreds of thousands of cars.

I saw two—two—United States cars. One was the one I was driving in from the Embassy, and the second car was my security detail behind me. Those were the only two U.S. cars, only two U.S. cars.

Our trade with Japan—I was in Japan as well. You need a detective to find a U.S. car in Japan. That is the plain and simple fact. They import \$1 billion worth of U.S.-manufactured products in auto and the air industry; we import \$25 billion.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts just to ask one simple question: What was that trade deal that you were talking about?

Mr. LYNCH. The Korea-U.S. trade agreement.

Mr. SESSIONS. Two years ago?

Mr. LYNCH. Two years ago.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thought you said you lost your job?

Mr. LYNCH. What is that? No, no, no. The job I lost—you were talking to people—the job I lost, 2,700 workers lost at the GM plant, those plants were reopened in Mexico.

Mr. SESSIONS. When was that? What trade deal?

Mr. LYNCH. That was right after NAFTA. That was another bad trade agreement.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, we gave you a good job, and you came to Congress.

I think the gentleman makes a point that I would like to make, and that is we need a trade deal with Japan to level the playing field, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), who sits on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairmen RYAN, SESSIONS, and TIBERI for their tireless effort to move us closer to realizing trade deals that will unlock new markets and bolster our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both the rule in front of us today and the trade promotion authority legislation we will consider tomorrow.

The benefits of increased free and fair trade are well established and undeniable. For companies in my State, the pending trade deals would remove tariff barriers and unlock doors for businesses such as Morris & Associates, who export the world's best poultry chilling equipment; or a company like Cummins Engine in my State to export U.S.-made engines; and to allow countless farms in my district and State to export hogs, chickens, tobacco, and sweet potatoes all across the globe. This means increased productivity, which means better wages and more jobs.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, TPA is about empowering Congress, making sure that this body and the people's elected representatives keep tight reins on this President.

Now, I am certainly no supporter of the President's laundry list of unconstitutional actions from immigration, to his administration's unilateral attempts to salvage the sinking ship that is ObamaCare, which is why TPA is needed.

The President is going to negotiate trade deals whether or not we pass TPA. Why wouldn't we want to make this President's negotiators more accountable, the deals themselves more transparent, and make our oversight more effective?

Now, here is how it works. If the President disregards the parameters Congress sets out or fails to consult Members at every step, Congress can turn off TPA. If the President comes back with a bad trade deal, Congress can vote it down.

Mr. Speaker, we need TPA to not only get the best deals possible, but also need this authority to check the President.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support TPA.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tlewoman from the land of cars, Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the rule we are considering today represents everything for me that is wrong with politics. We are currently debating the most important package of trade legislation in a generation; yet, despite how critical this issue is to American jobs, this rule does not allow any amendments.

Currency manipulation, the mother of all trade barriers, has cost this country as many as 5 million jobs. A bipartisan group of 20 Members—10 Republicans, 10 Democrats—proposed an amendment to address this, and it is vital that Congress debate and vote on how to address currency manipulation as we set U.S. trade policy for the next decade.

With nothing but the deepest of respect for the chair of the Rules Committee, I want to give you the facts about the Korean free trade agreement. The reality is that after it passed, we increased exports to Korea from 14,000 to 34,000.

By comparison, Korea exported 800,000 to the U.S. before the trade agreement and now exports 1.3 million. We increased our exports to Korea by 20,000, and they have increased their exports to this country by 461,000.

Toyota made more money last year in currency manipulation in this country than Ford Motor Company did in its worldwide operations.

The American people deserve a full and open debate on trade policy, not procedural gimmicks and political games that shut out amendments and avoid the tough questions.

Let's defeat this rule and have a real debate on the issues that the working men and women of this country have sent us here to consider and that are so critical to the livelihood and the backbone of this American economy. American jobs are at stake.

□ 1545

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Sunnyside, Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), a farmer and a rancher and a freshman Member on the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I thank the chairman for yielding his time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the rule and the underlying trade promotion authority granted by H.R. 1314.

As a member of the Rules Committee, I can affirm that the committee heard and seriously considered many amendments and concerns from both Democratic and Republican Members late into the night. This rule has been very fair, deliberative, and interested parties have been given ample opportunity to weigh in on it and on the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as you just heard, I come from the State of Washington, which is the most trade-benefited State in the country. If my colleagues want to see the benefit trade brings and the jobs it creates, they only have to look

at my State. We export coffee, aircraft, footwear, software—you name it. We also have an enormous agriculture industry. In Washington, we export fully 30 percent of the apples we grow, more than 85 percent of the wheat, 75 percent of the hops. Right now, consumers around the world are enjoying a brand new crop of fresh Washington State cherries, but the trade success story I want to share with you today is about potatoes.

Prior to the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement that the Congress passed and the President signed in 2011, we shipped \$53 million worth of french fries to South Korea. After that agreement was passed, that value rose to \$83 million—a 57 percent increase in just 2 years—largely attributed to the trade barriers that were lowered. For the record, that potato industry supports fully 24,000 jobs in my State. Those are good-paying jobs which are all supported by trade.

Trade promotion authority is about creating a fair playing field for American producers so we can create more jobs here at home. Most people may not know this, but, right now, American wines face 50 percent tariffs in Japan. Chilean and Argentinean wines face no tariffs at all. Our beef faces a 38 percent tariff—our oranges, a 16 percent tariff. TPA will instruct our negotiators to work on lowering these barriers to U.S. products.

Mr. Speaker, Americans produce some of the finest products in the world, and if given the chance to compete fairly, I believe they can. I have no doubt that we can outperform almost any competitor in the world, but we can't continue to allow other countries to stack the deck against us, which is happening right now. By granting the President the power to negotiate a treaty and by Congress telling him what priorities must be negotiated, we can create a fair playing field and create those jobs we need here at home.

I understand there are concerns about the privacy surrounding the TPP deal. I share those concerns, which is why I have personally gone and reviewed the text of this deal three times now.

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

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. The reason this vote on TPA is so important is that it will make the deal public. It will give the American people at least 2 months and as much as 5 months to review any negotiated deal. That is months to tell their Members of Congress whether they should support the deal or not. Without voting on TPA, there is no review period. The deal can stay a secret.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and the underlying bill are critical to our economy. Without TPA, our country will be left disadvantaged against other countries, and we will be left to trade with one arm tied behind our back. With it, we

can open new opportunities for our businesses. They can grow and create more jobs, and we can ensure that the American economy remains the most competitive, strongest economy in the world for decades to come.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today is filled with plenty of procedural gimmicks but with no opportunities to actually improve the underlying bills.

These bills fail to have enforceable environmental negotiating objectives; they fail to address currency manipulation adequately; and they fail to recognize climate change and its connection to trade. I had proposed amendments to address these issues, which were, unfortunately, not made in order.

Since NAFTA and other subsequent deals, millions of United States manufacturing jobs—one in four, in fact—have been lost, and when manufacturing workers lose their jobs due to trade, the story doesn't get much better: three in five of them take cuts if they find a new job. This is a bad deal for those who lose their jobs due to trade, of course, but it is also bad for all Americans, and it is one reason wages have stagnated for the last two decades. We cannot afford to fast-track another NAFTA on steroids.

On top of that, according to the Department of Labor, four TPP negotiating partners are using forced labor or child labor in violation of international standards. Are these the types of countries to which we want to give fast-tracked trade privileges? Plenty of multinational corporations will benefit from TPP, from increased drug prices to access to cheaper labor, when American jobs are offshored. That much is clear. Yet it is not clear how the average American worker—the people of New York's Capital Region that I represent and the people who sent all of us to be their voices in Washington—would benefit.

Let's end this foolishness and take up bills that actually help our working families by passing a minimum wage, by requiring paid family leave, by investing in STEM education and research, and by rebuilding our infrastructure.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule, to defeat this inadequate trade adjustment assistance and to defeat fast track. My message: Hands off the American worker. Hands off the American worker's children. Hands off the American Dream.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a very savvy member of our trade team and a gentleman from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of trade agreements being carried out all over the world today, and the United

States—our country—is sitting on the sidelines. Ninety-five percent of the market is closed off in many respects because we don't have trade agreements; we don't have the market opening. We are an open economy. They are sending stuff here, but we don't have the opportunity to sell there. That is a problem.

Let's talk about what trade promotion authority really is. At a very basic level, it is the catalyst for American economic engagement around the world. It is the catalyst for American leadership. I, for one—and, I think, for most of my friends here on this side of the aisle—am not ready to just step back and relinquish American leadership to others. That is just unacceptable. Trade promotion authority gets us started.

We are on the verge of negotiating two very important trade agreements with growing areas around the world—the Asia-Pacific region and the European Union. This represents the lion's share of gross domestic product growth around the world. Why would we want to lock ourselves out of these markets? It is absolutely ridiculous. It is absurd. We want the American worker to have access to those markets. I want mothers around the world to buy goods off the shelves that read, "Made in America." Those markets are closed. Let's open them. Let's get trade promotion authority in place.

What is it?

It is not the trade agreement, itself. It is the process by which we get the strongest and highest quality trade agreement for American workers that would be most beneficial to our country. It is the whole way we are going to achieve growth in this economy. We can't do it to the extent we need to without this. It puts Congress in the driver's seat, providing over 150 negotiating priorities that we set, not the administration. We set these as we negotiate with foreign countries. If we fail to pass this, the President negotiates on his own priorities, not on the priorities of the American people.

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

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Trade promotion authority gives more transparency to the whole process. Right now, we don't have the kind of transparency that is necessary. TPA, trade promotion authority, is public. That is public. That is the process. It is very public. Go to congress.gov. Anybody can read the legislation. It is public. Plus, passing TPA will require that the final trade agreement—those negotiations aren't done yet, but once they are concluded, the President has to make it public for 60 days in order for anybody and everybody to read it. That is transparency.

If we fail to pass this, we are giving up American leadership. We are basically throwing the American worker under the bus. We need growth. We need American leadership, and trade

promotion authority is the catalyst for providing that leadership. Trade promotion authority is necessary for Congress to provide the proper checks and balances on the administration. I don't want the administration negotiating without our having a robust consultative role in this, and that is what TPA does.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support this underlying legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the only way to get better trade agreements is to reject this fast-track bill and develop a better alternative that reflects our values and the realities of the 21st century.

As one who has supported legislation for more trade with most of the countries that are TPP agreement countries, I would like to support more trade today, but, as happened in the Ways and Means Committee, this rule shuts out every single attempt of Democrats to strengthen and improve this bill.

These Fast Trackers—they say they want free trade. Well how about trade that is free of secrecy and connivance? How about trade that is free of deals that jeopardize our the health and safety such as the food that we eat as American families? How about trade that is free of corporate panels that will be able to award taxpayer dollars to foreign corporations with more rights than American businesses, instead of relying on our system of justice?

I think we have to look at the trade agreements we have had in the past—the free trade agreements—and realize that, for too many American workers, they haven't been free. They have come at a tremendous cost. This trade agreement has been shrouded in secrecy in order to assure there is not a full and fair debate or a discussion of the failures of the USTR.

The USTR, as of right now, has not shared with this Congress a single document to show how Vietnam, instead of being the great human rights abuser it is today, will begin to show even the slightest measure of decency to its workers. The USTR has ignored the record of sex trafficking and human trafficking in Malaysia. One of the worst and in a category by itself with North Korea—and a handful of others—in human trafficking. And they are being rewarded in this deal.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Too often, the USTR simply does not believe in law enforcement. It wouldn't enforce the law in Guatemala and Honduras under prior labor agreements. In Peru, it ignored the audit responsibility that it had.

We can do better than this. We can do better than some kind of Christmas

wish list of multiple objectives that this President doesn't have to follow. And indeed, this Christmas wish list is being proposed for the next President, who has not even been elected—an open-ended ability to have more trade agreements that come at the cost of too many families. We can do better.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I just love our friends who come up to the podium and talk about jobs; yet it is this administration and the Democrat policies that have taken American jobs, including ObamaCare, climate change, and all of the other rules and regulations—175,000 pages of rules and regulations—and have inhibited growth and job development in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), one of the most exciting new, young Members of Congress.

□ 1600

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this. We have a duty here to legislate based on truth and not on fiction. Let's establish the facts. First of all, if you want really strong trade agreements, then you have to be in a position to negotiate those because, I will tell you, my friends, if we are not at the table, we are on the menu.

As we talk about growing the economy and growing jobs and making sure that America is secure going into the future, and if you are worried about having an agreement that doesn't meet the demands that the American people are asking for, trade promotion authority is the only thing that gives us the ability to drive strong trade agreements to make sure that every single American is taken care of.

Now, this TPA does not give President Obama any new power, none whatsoever. For those of us who don't trust the President's judgment, then TPA is absolutely necessary. It is not an option. We look at things and we talk about the people's House and what the responsibility of the people's House is and how would the people's House move forward.

This puts us in the driver's seat. This allows this Congress, the people's House, to set the parameters of any future trade agreements. It does not negate them; it enforces them. So if you are worried about a strong trade agreement, then make sure that we give ourselves the power to actually set the parameters of the way a trade agreement should look.

It is time to get rid of all this bogeyman talk about what is going on. I have got to tell you, if you want the United States of America to dominate a global economy and not just participate in a global economy, then you have to have trade promotion authority. My lifetime has been spent negotiating. When you sit down at the table to actually negotiate something, the question that always came up to me: Was there anybody else other than yourself that would be responsible for

making the decision? Without that decision, without that clarity, we can't draw on strong trade agreements. TPA is the only thing that gives us that. If you want to strengthen our country, if you want to grow our economy, if you want to create new jobs for America, then we need strong trade agreements.

Now, fast track, anything but fast track. Smart track, safe track, sure track, and something that gets America's economy back on track—absolutely. Vote for TPA. Vote for American jobs. Vote for the United States of America to drive the global economy and continue to write the rules and not China.

If you really are concerned about American jobs, and if you are really concerned about America's role in the world, then don't put us behind; put us in front. Let America, with the strongest economy, drive the trade agreements. TPA gives us that, gives us the ability to grow an American economy, grow American jobs, and make America more safe and secure. And it gives our partners around the world the certainty that America has not walked away from the table; America will continue to be your strongest partner and your strongest ally to build a stronger and more safe world.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this rule covers three bills. It covers TAA and TPA. I asked Rules to place in order a substitute bill on TPA that would have helped a full discussion of this vital issue affecting 40 percent of global GDP. Under the rule before us, if a majority does not vote for TAA, there will not be a vote on TPA tomorrow. This will give the House another opportunity to improve TPA and TAA, of which I am an author. TAA should not be a bargaining chip for a flawed TPA bill.

The third bill, Customs, weakens the TPA bill on human trafficking, prohibits any provision in TPP relating to climate, likewise as to immigration, and strikes out the Schumer provision on currency manipulation. The manager's amendment on currency is more rhetorical language without any teeth.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Genoa Township, Ohio (Mr. TIBERI). He is one of our three captains that has driven this entire thing in addition to Chairman PAUL RYAN and myself. He has done an outstanding job.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership. Texas is lucky to have him.

Ladies and gentlemen, today and tomorrow, we are not voting on a trade agreement. We are not voting on a trade agreement. In fact, we are voting

on a bill called TPA, which is this. It is public. We can all read it. Our constituents can read it. We are not voting on anything today or tomorrow that we can't read, that is secret.

A lot of confusion out there. Here is what TPA is, and you have heard it before. It is a process. It is a process where Congress inserts itself to what the executive branch already can do, which is negotiate a trade agreement. But it is a process that, quite frankly, empowers the Congress. It tells the President, as the lead negotiator, this is what we would like him to do, and we are going to hold our authority, and we are going to say whatever the President negotiates, we are going to either approve it or not.

But you know what? By passing TPA, we are going to require that, whatever is negotiated, the public is given 60 days to review, which doesn't have to be done unless TPA is passed.

Mr. Chairman, I didn't have 6 hours to review ObamaCare—not 6 hours. My constituents will have 60 days before the President can sign any deal he negotiates. That is what TPA does. It inserts Congress. It inserts the American people into any trade agreement the President—this one or the next—negotiates. It empowers the people to review that process, to review that agreement—no secrecy.

This is what we are voting on tomorrow, ladies and gentlemen, TPA. Please go to congress.gov to look at it. Another day, maybe tomorrow, we will talk a little bit about what trade has done, not done, what it has done for American consumers and American employees and American businesses.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). The gentlewoman from New York has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me take 30 seconds and say, that is really great, go ahead and read the TPA, but it is the bill we are worried about, the TPP. We have to have an armed guard, practically, to go look at that.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there really is quite a lot on the line here, despite what some speakers would submit, which is, oh, you know, this is just the TPA; it is not a big thing. No, this is a huge thing.

As a matter of fact, this particular rule we are voting on right now does three important things. One is that it has the pay-for for the trade adjustment assistance that includes cuts to Medicare. No matter how you slice it, if you vote for this rule, you are voting to cut Medicare. Then what it does, it sets up a vote for the trade adjustment assistance and trade promotion authority.

The fact is, if you go home and you try to explain to Americans, "Oh, I

didn't vote to cut Medicare," the fact is you will not be able to honestly say that. You might be able to say, "Well, I did, but then they fixed it." You might be able to say, "Well, yeah, I cut Medicare, but then later on we passed a thing and maybe MITCH MCCONNELL won't try to change it later." You can say anything you want, but the maneuverings on this floor and in this body to get us to where we are have not changed one solid fact, which is that we are voting to cut Medicare.

Now, there are all kinds of cute procedural maneuverings and different kinds of rules we are invoking, but you cannot escape the essential fact: the cut to Medicare is not going to be cut and excised out of this. If you vote for the rule, you voted to cut Medicare. Our seniors have taken enough on the chin. Do not put their livelihood at risk.

Now, let me also say that this TAA is not supported by the AFL-CIO. Trade adjustment assistance is to help workers who are displaced by bad trade deals. Wouldn't you think that the president of the AFL-CIO would say, "Yeah, well, we definitely would want TAA"? And he usually almost always does, but not this time because he knows what all of us should know, which is this trade adjustment authority is cutting Medicare.

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

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

Mr. ELLISON. This trade adjustment authority is paid for by Medicare. It continues to be underfunded. Trade adjustment authority is underfunded. It is like if you kick somebody off their job because of a bad trade deal and then you tell them, "We are going to help you adjust to it." Well, you know what? At least we should fund it properly. Given the billions of dollars that will be made by this trade deal by multinational corporations, doesn't it make sense that we should at least try to fully fund trade adjustment authority, trade adjustment assistance? But we don't.

Then the fact is that it excludes public sector workers. Public sector workers are negatively impacted by bad trade deals, just like all other workers. Why wouldn't we include them in it? They are not included in it.

So this TAA, this trade adjustment assistance, package is insufficient. We must vote it down. I urge a "no" vote. I just want to let Members know, when you walk into that senior center and Mrs. McGillicuddy asks you, "Did you vote to cut Medicare?" I hope you can answer truthfully you did not vote to cut Medicare. Vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's bad trade bills have gutted our manufacturing economy, transformed our stature on the global stage,

and taken millions of jobs from American workers. Heavens to Betsy, let's not do it again. We need to demand a trade deal that will let us sell American-made goods to every customer in the world, and we need a trade bill that is negotiated through a transparent and open process that doesn't mortgage our patents, our innovation, and our future.

Let me echo what Congressman ELLISON just said. This rule, this vote right now that we are about to take, codifies, it ensures, that this money for the trade adjustment assistance will come from Medicare. That is what will go to the President. If you vote for this, you are voting for Medicare to be used in that way.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I support TPA because it provides an unprecedented level of transparency. Let me be clear. A vote for TPA is a vote for jobs. It is a vote so that we can grow our economy. It is not a vote for a secret document. It is a vote to set up a process that ensures the American people understand exactly what any trade deal is before Congress votes on it. We will have 60 days to do that. TPA requires that the President make public the text of a complicated trade agreement for at least 60 days, and we are going to do just that.

Over the last few months, I have worked with Chairman PAUL RYAN and Chairman PAT TIBERI and other Members of Congress to strengthen TPA so that the President cannot hijack free trade agreements. I think it is obvious here: no one in this body really trusts the President of the United States to go and negotiate something that we would be in favor of. That is why we are making this trade TPA, so that we are following our agenda, one that we know that we have heard of. We have heard the concerns of the American people regarding immigration, climate change, currency, American sovereignty, and I think we have addressed all of these.

My constituents are just like me. They want to know that we are going to support jobs. But we do not trust the President, and that is why we are doing this deal today. This grants no new authority to the President of the United States.

Just the other day, I began working further after the Senate passed their TPA bill, and I worked with Congressman STEVE KING of Iowa to ensure that the trade agreements do not require changes to U.S. immigration laws or to obligate the United States to gain access or to extend access to visas.

We had an excellent idea, also, that we took from Senator TED CRUZ from Texas. We just strengthened it and made it more straightforward, and it is in this deal that we do.

This trade package also includes language that would prohibit the adminis-

tration from attaching any climate change commitments to a trading agreement.

□ 1615

We have also worked to guarantee that American sovereignty is upheld. TPA reflects what the Constitution requires, and that is that Congress maintain authority over any changes to U.S. law and our constitutional rights to approve any trade agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule. I look forward to the debate that will follow. I urge my colleagues to listen to every single bit of this, and they will understand why a vote for TPA and this rule is the right thing to do.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule to consider the Senate amendment to H.R. 644, Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.

I strongly support legislation to update the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) as it exists today. That said, I must voice my great dismay with the inclusion of H.R. 878, the "United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act," in a vehicle that circumvents regular order and is under threat of veto.

Enactment of CBP authorization legislation could help clarify and enhance Congressional intent for this critical agency as well as the oversight of its activities. In the previous Congress, the Committee on Homeland Security marked up and reported such legislation, which was subsequently considered and passed by the House. Because authorizing such a large and important agency requires a thoughtful and thorough approach, H.R. 878 should have gone through regular order this Congress.

There are 10 new Members of Congress serving on the Committee on Homeland Security this Congress. Upending regular order, as the House Leadership is doing, effectively prevents my Committee and its newest members from applying the knowledge we acquired through oversight about CBP programs and activities to improving the legislation before us today.

Moreover, the text of the legislation in which these important provisions are included was just made available at midnight on Wednesday, and we are now considering it under a rule that does not allow for amendments. By limiting the ability of my Members to weigh in on the CBP Authorization provisions, even if only on the House floor, we are denied the opportunity to address changes that the Ways and Means Committee made to the text.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I support authorizing U.S. Customs and Border Protection but am deeply disappointed that the fate of this non-controversial legislation, which was overwhelmingly approved by the 113th Congress on suspension, is now tied to controversial measures that the President may well veto. This, Mr. Speaker, is no way to legislate.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 212, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

YEAS—217

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

NAYS—212

Adams	Garrett	Neal
Aguilar	Gibson	Nolan
Amash	Gohmert	Norcross
Ashford	Gosar	O'Rourke
Bass	Graham	Pallone
Beatty	Grayson	Palmer
Becerra	Green, Al	Pascarell
Bera	Green, Gene	Payne
Beyer	Griffith	Pearce
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Pelosi
Blum	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hahn	Perry
Boyle, Brendan	Harris	Peters
F.	Hastings	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Brat	Hice, Jody B.	Pocan
Bridenstine	Higgins	Polis
Brooks (AL)	Hinojosa	Posey
Brown (FL)	Honda	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Quigley
Buck	Huffman	Rangel
Bustos	Israel	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Capps	Jeffries	Rothfus
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Jones	Ruiz
Carney	Jordan	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rush
Cartwright	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Salmon
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Chu, Judy	Kildee	T.
Ciilline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Schakowsky
Clay	Labrador	Schiff
Cleaver	Langevin	Schrader
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Schweikert
Cohen	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee	Scott, David
Hunter	Levin	Serrano
Courtney	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
Cummings	Lipinski	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Loeback	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lowe	Speier
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Stutzman
DelBene	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Takai
Deutch	(NM)	Takano
Dingell	Lummis	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Lynch	Titus
Doyle, Michael	Maloney,	Tonko
F.	Carolyn	Torres
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Van Hollen
Edwards	Matsui	Vargas
Ellison	McCollum	Veasey
Engel	McDermott	Vela
Eshoo	McGovern	Velázquez
Esty	McNerney	Visclosky
Farr	Meadows	Walz
Fattah	Meeks	Wasserman
Fleming	Meng	Schultz
Foster	Mooney (WV)	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Watson Coleman
Franks (AZ)	Moulton	Webster (FL)
Gallego	Mulvaney	Welch
Garamendi	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
	Nadler	Yarmuth
	Napolitano	Yoho

NOT VOTING—5

Amodei	Gowdy	Thompson (CA)
Clawson (FL)	Himes	

□ 1650

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. WALORSKI, Messrs. WITTMAN, BLUMENAUER, DELANEY, and ROHRBACHER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. 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 172, answered "present" 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

AYES—239

Abraham	Esty	Maloney,
Adams	Farr	Carolyn
Aderholt	Fattah	Marino
Allen	Fincher	Massie
Barletta	Fleischmann	McCarthy
Barton	Fortenberry	McCaul
Becerra	Franks (AZ)	McClintock
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	McCollum
Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	McHenry
Bishop (UT)	Gallego	McKinley
Black	Goodlatte	McMorris
Blackburn	Graham	Rodgers
Blum	Granger	McNerney
Blumenauer	Grayson	McSally
Bonamici	Grothman	Meadows
Boustany	Guthrie	Meehan
Brady (TX)	Hahn	Meng
Brat	Hardy	Mica
Bridenstine	Harper	Miller (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Moolenaar
Brooks (IN)	Hartzler	Mooney (WV)
Byrne	Heck (WA)	Moulton
Calvert	Hensarling	Mullin
Capps	Higgins	Nadler
Carney	Hill	Newhouse
Carson (IN)	Himes	Noem
Carter (TX)	Hinojosa	Nunes
Cartwright	Hoyer	O'Rourke
Castro (TX)	Hultgren	Olson
Chabot	Hurt (TX)	Palmer
Chu, Judy	Hurt (VA)	Pascarell
Ciilline	Johnson (GA)	Pelosi
Clay	Johnson, Sam	Perlmutter
Cleaver	Jolly	Pingree
Cohen	Katko	Pocan
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Polis
Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Pompeo
Conaway	Kennedy	Posey
Conyers	Kildee	Price (NC)
Cook	King (IA)	Quigley
Cooper	King (NY)	Rangel
Courtney	Kline	Reichert
Cramer	Knight	Ribble
Crawford	Kuster	Roby
Crenshaw	Labrador	Roe (TN)
Crowley	LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)
Cuellar	Lamborn	Rokita
Culberson	Larsen (WA)	Rooney (FL)
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Roskam
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Ross
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Rothfus
DeLauro	Lipinski	Royce
DelBene	Loeback	Ruiz
Dent	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
DeSaulnier	Long	Russell
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Ryan (WI)
Deutch	Lowenthal	Salmon
Dingell	Lowe	Sanford
Doggett	Lucas	Scalise
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Lujan Grisham	Scott (VA)
Edwards	(NM)	Scott, Austin
Emmer (MN)	Luján, Ben Ray	Scott, David
Engel	(NM)	Sensenbrenner
Eshoo	Lummis	Serrano
		Sessions
		Shimkus
		Shuster
		Simpson

Smith (NE)	Titus	Westerman
Smith (NJ)	Trott	Westmoreland
Smith (TX)	Upton	Whitfield
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Williams
Speier	Wagner	Wilson (SC)
Stefanik	Walorski	Womack
Stewart	Walters, Mimi	Yarmuth
Stutzman	Wasserman	Young (IA)
Takai	Schultz	Young (IN)
Takano	Waters, Maxine	Zeldin
Thornberry	Webster (FL)	Zinke
Tiberi	Welch	

□ 1700

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY AND FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT PARTNERSHIP

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

Mr. CURBELLO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the newly announced partnership with Florida International University, a nationally respected institution of higher learning in my district, and Florida Power and Light.

FIU and FPL are working toward providing cleaner energy solutions to south Florida, something I wholeheartedly support. The project involves the installation of more than 5,700 solar panels on 23 canopy-like structures that will be constructed over the next few months in FIU's engineering center parking lot. Engineering students at FIU will directly monitor the amount of energy generated from these solar panels and the effects they have on the electricity grid that provides power for south Florida.

It was recently announced that FPL, which already is the largest generator of solar energy in Florida, is expected to triple its presence in the business by 2016. Such an undertaking is only possible with talented and capable students, and I am glad to see FPL is helping to train a new generation of engineers that will create fresh solutions for our energy needs.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate FIU and FPL on their partnership and wish them success. I look forward to visiting the campus soon and seeing the progress being made.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this year's Defense Appropriations bill relies on adding an additional \$38 billion into the overseas contingency operations account, the OCO account. This budgeting gimmick is an end around to sequestration. It avoids the hard work that is required to reach a budget agreement and repeal sequestration once and for all. OCO funds are supposed to be used for war operations, and their use in the legislation misleads the American people.

The sequester cuts continue to have devastating impact on our schools, our Nation's infrastructure, and our investments in scientific research. Now is the time to fix this sequester, not deceive the American people about defense spending.

Our servicemembers and their families deserve to know their future more than just 1 year at a time. As a nation, we need to base our military strategy on an appropriate, long-term defense

spending plan, not a budgetary gimmick.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for this legislation because we cannot leave our troops who are currently in harm's way without funding. As the appropriations process moves forward, I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to provide our military with the long-term support it needs and the American people with the transparency that they deserve.

IN MEMORY OF LOWELL ROBINSON

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in fond memory of a friend from Nevada County, Lowell Robinson, who is a community icon who passed away just recently at age 86.

Born in Nevada City in April 1929, his entrepreneurial career started in 1949 when he designed equipment for a local sawmill. A few years later, he began the logging business known as Robinson & Sons. In 1971, he helped establish Robinson Enterprises, which includes gold mining, road construction, logging, and petroleum distribution and sales.

Mr. Robinson was an active supporter, in many ways, of the Nevada County community. Indeed, he was a very kind gentlemen, liked by everybody, and his legacy will be felt for many, many years in the work he did for helping United Way, FFA, 4-H, Boy Scouts. Just about anything worth doing, he was involved with in Nevada County, including my own personal travels.

This little old Indian Springs school still stands where he attended and his family owns. I hope some day they can renovate it in his honor.

So I join the community of Nevada County in mourning this loss, a great friend, a personal friend of mine who was always a kindhearted person whom you just got along great with. Our condolences go out to Wanda and his whole family.

ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY IS A SERIOUS MISCALCULATION

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have generally admired President Obama's bold foreign policy decisions. However, the administration's latest announcement to send an additional 450 U.S. military advisers to Iraq and to arm the Sunni tribes, the Shia forces, and the Kurdish Peshmerga, alike, is a grave misjudgment.

Arming the Sunni tribes could undermine Iraqi Prime Minister Abadi and the central government the U.S. is trying desperately to prop up. Sunni assistance may, in turn, push Iran to

NOES—172

Aguilar	Griffith	Paulsen
Amash	Guinta	Payne
Babin	Gutiérrez	Peters
Barr	Hanna	Peterson
Beatty	Hastings	Pittenger
Benishkek	Heck (NV)	Poe (TX)
Bera	Herrera Beutler	Poliquin
Beyer	Hice, Jody B.	Price, Tom
Bishop (MI)	Holding	Ratcliffe
Bost	Honda	Reed
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hudson	Renacci
Brady (PA)	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (NY)
Brownley (CA)	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Buck	Israel	Richmond
Bucshon	Issa	Rigell
Burgess	Jackson Lee	Rogers (AL)
Capuano	Jeffries	Rohrabacher
Cárdenas	Jenkins (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cárdenas	Jenkins (WV)	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Chaffetz	Jones	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clark (MA)	Jordan	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Joyce	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Coffman	Kilmer	Schiff
Connolly	Kind	Schrader
Costa	Kinzinger (IL)	Sewell (AL)
Costello (PA)	Kirkpatrick	Sherman
Davis, Rodney	Lance	Sinema
DeFazio	Langevin	Sires
DeGette	Lee	Slaughter
Delaney	Levin	Smith (MO)
Denham	Lewis	Stivers
DeSantis	Lieu, Ted	Swalwell (CA)
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Thompson (MS)
Dold	Love	Thompson (PA)
Duckworth	Lynch	Tipton
Duffy	MacArthur	Tsongas
Duncan (SC)	Maloney, Sean	Turner
Ellison	Marchant	Valadao
Farenthold	Matsui	Vargas
Fitzpatrick	McDermott	Veasey
Fleming	McGovern	Vela
Flores	Messer	Velázquez
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Visclosky
Fox	Moore	Walberg
Fudge	Mulvaney	Walden
Garamendi	Murphy (FL)	Walker
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Watson Coleman
Gibbs	Napolitano	Weber (TX)
Gibson	Neal	Wenstrup
Gosar	Neugebauer	Wilson (FL)
Graves (GA)	Nolan	Wittman
Graves (LA)	Norcross	Woodall
Graves (MO)	Nugent	Yoder
Green, Al	Palazzo	Yoho
Green, Gene	Pallone	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—21

Amodei	Ellmers (NC)	Ryan (OH)
Ashford	Foster	Thompson (CA)
Bass	Frankel (FL)	Tonko
Clawson (FL)	Gowdy	Torres
Collins (GA)	Grijalva	Walz
Collins (NY)	Meeks	Young (AK)
Doyle, Michael F.	Pearce	
	Pitts	

□ 1657

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

more aggressively arm their Shia militias in Iraq.

Worse still, arming the Shia fighters will further inflame Iraq's deep sectarian divide, which ISIS has exploited so skillfully. The Kurdish Peshmerga is perhaps the only reliable and ready force deserving of U.S. military assistance, but no amount of heavy weaponry will defeat ISIS without a concerted political settlement both in Baghdad and Damascus.

All of this comes just days after President Obama has said, yet again, we do not have a complete strategy to defeat ISIS in Iraq or Syria.

The U.S. has few palpable options when it comes to untangling the region's current chaos. However, the administration's current strategy "to arm everyone and let God sort them out" is a serious miscalculation.

FAST TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to address the issues that we will be voting on tomorrow: trade adjustment assistance and the trade promotion authority, or fast track.

I know that a number of my colleagues are within the sound of my voice, and I hope that if they share my views on these issues they will come down to the floor and invite me to yield them time. Until then, I am going to first focus on the trade adjustment assistance bill that will be before us tomorrow.

There are so many reasons to vote against trade adjustment assistance in this form, even if it was a freestanding bill. First, it is inadequate. It has got roughly \$450 million, and there is no assurance that that money will be available next year or the year after that.

We know that the majority of this House is actually opposed to funding this program at all. They are doing it in an effort to pass fast track. Once fast track is passed, every effort will be made on this floor to cut this program to zero. Bait and switch, you have been warned.

Second, this amount of money, who is supposed to be eligible? The proponents of fast track have said, well, we have expanded those who are eligible, not just those who lose their jobs because of the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal we are planning, not just those who lost their job because of NAFTA, but everybody who has lost their job because of globalization in any of its forms. Well, that is also a bait and switch.

They are able to tell tens of millions of Americans you are going to be eligible for this program, but the program has only \$450 million in it nationwide. So it is like you win because we give

you a lottery ticket, and then we determine whether you will be one of the very small percentage of those who have lost their job due to globalization who benefit from the program.

This program is inadequate. It also explicitly contains language excluding any public sector employee from a benefit. Imagine that great unfairness. If you are at a public university and somehow grading of tests is offshored, you can't benefit. But if you are at a private university, same job, same offshoring, whether it be a call center or any of the other services that can be offshored in today's modern age, you could possibly—you are probably not going to get anything—but you can, at least, apply for a benefit.

The exclusion of the public sector may have made sense 40 or 50 years ago when only manufacturing jobs were subject to foreign competition. Today, anything that is done on the Internet, anything that is done on the phone, anything that is part of the information economy is a job that can be taken offshore. It is going to be very difficult for Members of this House to explain that they voted for a program that slapped in the face those who lose their jobs because it is a public sector job.

The biggest problem with TAA is that it cuts Medicare two different ways. One way we are told is an acceptable way to cut Medicare, and the other we are told isn't going to really happen. It is actually two cuts to Medicare.

The first that they say they have ironed out is the \$700 million cut to Medicare that will, under the rule just passed in this House by a small majority, graft itself onto the Trade Adjustment Assistance bill if that bill unfortunately passes. So you will be in a position to explain why you voted for a bill, knowing full well that as soon as it passed, a \$700 million cut to Medicare was grafted on it and that the President would have on his desk and intended to sign a bill that cut Medicare by \$700 million.

Now, you can present a complicated chart showing how you voted for Trade Adjustment Assistance but you didn't vote for the rule, and the cut for Medicare was supposed to be undone by the other bill that you voted for before you voted against it. And if you are able to make that explanation, more power to you.

But if you are a Democrat, you will be in a particularly weak position to make that explanation, because the AFL-CIO issued a letter today that said a vote for Trade Adjustment Assistance in this form with this rule in this "here you see it, now you don't; we will take it away, don't worry about it" Medicare cut is a cut to Medicare. So you are going to be explaining why your opponent's attack on you is unfair when you are a Democrat and you say it is unfair, but the AFL-CIO says it is not only fair, it is absolutely true. A special problem for Democrats. Repub-

licans will not have the difficulty in explaining why they disagree with the AFL-CIO.

Then there is a Medicare cut that is supposed to become law. This is the dialysis cut, and here is the thinking: Medicare will be more efficient in dealing with dialysis. We pass a statute that allows them to make use of clinics instead of hospitals. So through new procedures and new technology, Medicare will save roughly \$250 million.

Okay. Does Medicare keep that savings? No. It is used to buy votes for fast track.

Now, how is Medicare going to be sustained if every time new technology allows Medicare to save money, we take the savings and use it for something else, but every time new technology creates new medical costs, new things for Medicare to pay for, well, Medicare has to pay for them?

If we establish a principle that every new technology that saves Medicare money is money to be spent on something else and every change in medical technology that increases Medicare's cost has to come out of Medicare, Medicare will be bankrupt and will go bankrupt more quickly as we change medicine.

□ 1715

That cut is supposed to become law if you vote for TAA, but TAA is on this floor for only one reason. It is a way to put a bandaid on a giant decapitation of the American middle class, a tiny program designed to facilitate the passage of a trade bill which will govern 40 percent of the world's GDP.

Don't be in enabler. Do not go back home and say you opposed fast track, but that you voted for the bill that will enable fast track. If you are against fast track, then you have got to vote "no" on TAA.

Well, what about fast track? What about this new Asia deal that is being negotiated? In the past, the proponents of these trade deals have come forward and said that they were going to reduce our trade deficit and create more jobs than will be lost.

For this deal, they don't even make that assertion. Their bait and switch is to say it will create some jobs in exports, but they are so arithmetically challenged, they don't then subtract out the jobs that will be lost to imports.

The fact is that time and again the proponents of our current trade policy have wildly misestimated the job effect of each action. For example, on this floor, we were told that the trade agreement with South Korea would reduce our trade deficit. That deficit has skyrocketed. We were told that permanent most favored nation status for China would increase our trade deficit by only \$1 billion. The proponents were off by 30,000 percent.

Now, they don't even say that we are going to get more jobs than we will lose; they simply say the jobs we lose don't count because that involves subtraction. The fact is that this is bad for

the American middle class, as has our policy over the years.

Since NAFTA, we have hollowed out the middle class; we have hollowed out American manufacturing. Since NAFTA, we have had a stagnation of wages in this country. Now, as we begin to recover from the catastrophe of 2008, now, as there begins to be the possibility that employers are going to have to pay more in wages to compete for employees, we have a giant trade deal that guarantees that wages will decline or stagnate for another decade or longer.

The economics are against the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the fast track that is designed to carry it, so there is a shift. The argument now is, well, it may be bad for our economy, but it is a great anti-China alliance, great geopolitics, disguised as a bad trade deal.

I have been on the Foreign Affairs Committee for 19 years. I am the ranking member on the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee. I am here to tell you this deal is not only bad economic policy; it is bad geopolitics as well.

Let's look at how China benefits from this deal. First and foremost, we are told that this deal is going to set the terms of trade in Asia. Then you go to the basement, and you look at this deal, and, as reported in the press, there is a statement that there will not be anything in this trade deal about currency manipulation.

China, if this deal goes forward, wins without even having to sign it. China gets a new approach to world trade, which is currency manipulation, go to it, it will be applauded, it will not be counted; but China gets something even more. Go deeper into the basement and look at the rule of origin provisions. Now, what are these rules of origin provisions?

You would think that under this deal, goods made in Vietnam, goods made in Japan, goods made in the other countries that are part of the deal come into our country duty free, that this deal benefits goods made in Japan, Vietnam, et cetera, but only to the countries that sign the deal.

Then you get down to the details, and you see that goods that are 50 or 60 percent made outside the countries that are parties to this deal, goods that are 50 or 60 percent made in China, are eligible to be fast-tracked into the United States with no tariffs and no limits, and goods where the manufacturer admits that it is 50 or 60 percent made in China may actually be 70 or 80 percent made in China.

Goods that are chiefly Chinese-made get the benefit of this agreement, with China not even having to sign it. Our trade deficit will balloon not only from goods that are really made in Japan and really made in Vietnam—and those are the two countries added to the free trade regime by this agreement; we already have free trade agreements with the others that are part of these Trans-Pacific Partnership; those are the two main countries—not only goods made

in those countries, but goods that are just kind of polished in Vietnam, finished in Japan, but made in China.

We are told that this is part of some clever system to contain China when in reality, we established the international principle, the currency manipulation, the number one tactic of China to run up the largest trade deficit in history. We have the largest trade deficit; they have the largest trade surplus in history. That becomes the norm.

Then second, goods chiefly made in China, finished in Japan, get duty free into the United States.

But finally, think of what an insult it is to our men and women in uniform to be told that our allies in Asia are so disdainful of our help as they fight China over the islets that are in question, that we have to give away our jobs and enter into a bad trade deal just to have the honor of deploying our troops and our Navy to defend the islets claimed by Korea, Japan, and Vietnam.

You would think that the willingness of America to put its blood and treasure on the line to defend not only our allies, but even Vietnam, would be enough, not that we would be told that in order to have that honor, we have to enter into this trade agreement.

Finally—and, Mr. Speaker, I will end with this, there is the issue of admitting Vietnam into this deal. We are told that the purpose of this deal, the upside, is that we get free access to Vietnam's markets, free access to their markets. The only problem is Vietnam doesn't have freedom and it does not have markets.

This deal is great for Nike. They can manufacture shoes in Vietnam and pay 30–40 cents an hour. They can then add a few jobs in Oregon as they hire the marketing skill necessary to push off the shelves the last remnant of American-made shoes.

They can add some jobs in Oregon where they can find the tax lawyers to make sure that they don't pay any U.S. taxes on the enormous profit that you can get by making a shoe for 40 cents an hour and selling it for \$140. A few jobs, which will lead to pushing off the shelves all the American-made shoes. That is what we get on the import side.

The jobs we get are tax lawyers making sure that the importers don't pay any taxes. By the way, it has already been revealed that Nike will save several hundred million dollars in taxes on this, chiefly tariffs.

What access do we get for our exporters? Well, right now, Vietnam does have some tariffs. The tariffs go to the government. The entity paying the tariff is whoever is doing the exporting. Those importers are all owned and controlled—or at least controlled—by the government.

Right now, if Vietnam imports anything from the United States, the Vietnamese Government pays itself a tariff. If this deal goes forward, that tariff will be lower, so they will pay them-

selves less. Paying themselves money is an irrelevancy.

We don't have access to the Vietnamese market just because Vietnamese Government-controlled or Vietnamese Government-owned enterprises will be paying a smaller tariff to the Vietnamese Government of which they are part to begin with.

Tariffs are not the limit on what we export to Vietnam. Vietnam makes a political decision, a nationwide economic planning decision which products to import to the United States. They are importing what they choose to import; they are not importing what they choose not to import, and they are going to keep doing it.

To assume that just because lowering tariffs means you sell more goods in the United States, means lowering tariffs, means you sell more goods in Vietnam, we are required to imagine that the Vietnamese economy, a communist economy, is just like ours. That is an absurd assumption.

The Vietnamese centrally planned economy will or will not import from the United States whatever they choose to. Their published tariffs are an irrelevancy. Their promise to change those tariffs is a promise to change an irrelevancy. We are a nation of free markets. When we change our public tariffs, that opens up our markets to all the tennis shoes that can be made for 40 cents an hour.

This is a terrible deal for the American people. It is part of a continued policy of what they call free trade. What America needs is fair trade. What America needs is to say that those who want access to the U.S. market must be willing to buy U.S. goods and services. What America needs is an understanding that we need results-oriented trade agreements.

We are in the deepest hole ever. We are the largest debtor nation in the world. We have the largest trade deficit in the world. We would expect that the dollar will crash not this decade, but next decade. The first thing you do when you are in a hole that deep is to stop digging.

The first step is to stop this fast track. Then the next step is to deploy our trade negotiators with the power to say—the issue isn't whether we are going to lower our tariffs; we are a sovereign nation; we can increase our tariffs—if you want access to the U.S. market, everything is on the table, and a fair, balanced trade result is the requirement, if you want access to the one thing that the entire world wants, and that is access to the U.S. market.

I see no one seeking time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 11, 2015.

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO TRADE LEGISLATION

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for printing in the Congress-

sional Record revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates of the Fiscal Year 2016 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, S. Con. Res. 11, pursuant to section 4506 of such concurrent resolution. These revisions are designated for the following trade legislation: H.R. 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, H.R. 1295, the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, and H.R. 1314, the Trade Act of 2015. Corresponding tables are attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of budgetary enforcement. These revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as the aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted.

Sincerely,
TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

TABLE 1—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES

BUDGET AGGREGATES
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year	
	2016	2016–2025
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,039,215	1
Outlays	3,091,442	1
Revenues	2,676,733	32,237,371
Adjustment for the amendment to the Senate amendment to HR 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015		
Budget Authority	20	1
Outlays	20	1
Revenues	-9	-1
Adjustment for HR 1314, the Trade Act of 2015		
Budget Authority	445	1
Outlays	175	1
Revenues	-42	-86
Adjustment for the amendment to Senate amendment to HR 1295, the Trade Preference Extension Act of 2015		
Budget Authority	0	1
Outlays	0	1
Revenues	-724	-5,237
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,039,680	1
Outlays	3,091,637	1
Revenues	2,675,958	32,232,047

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2017–2025 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

House Committee on Ways and Means	2016		2016–2025 total	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Current Allocation:	962,805	962,080	13,224,077	13,222,960
Adjustment for the amendment to the Senate amendment to HR 644, the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015	20	20	-4	-4
Adjustment for HR 1314, the Trade Act of 2015	445	175	-174	-174
Adjustment for the amendment to Senate amendment to HR 1295, the Trade Preference Extension Act of 2015	0	0	-5,940	-5,940
Revised Allocation:	963,270	962,275	13,217,959	13,216,842

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 12, 2015, 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:

1803. A letter from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization; Institution Stockholder Voting Procedures (RIN: 3052-AC85) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1804. A letter from the Director, Issuances Staff, Office of Policy and Program Development, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Descriptive Designation for Needle- or Blade-Tenderized (Mechanically Tenderized) Beef Products [Docket No.: FSIS-2008-0017] (RIN: 0583-AD45) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1805. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Financial Stability Oversight Council's 2015 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 112(a)(2)(N) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1806. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 1, 2, 15, 25, 27, 74, 78, 80, 87, 90, 97, and 101 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Implementation of the Final Acts of the World Radiocommunication Conference (Geneva, 2007)(WRC-07), Other Allocation Issues, and Related Rule Updates [ET Docket No.: 12-338] (Proceeding Terminated) [ET Docket No.: 15-99] [IB Docket No.: 06-123] received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1807. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Natural Gas Act Pipeline Maps [Docket No.: RM14-21-000; Order No.: 801] received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1808. A letter from the Assistant Director for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cuban Assets Control Regulations; Terrorism List Governments Sanctions Regula-

tions received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1809. A letter from the General Counsel, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting the Conference's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1810. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, during the period from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Pub. L. 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1811. A letter from the Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, and the Semiannual Management Report for the period ending March 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of Pub. L. 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1812. A letter from the Director, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, for the period ending March 31, 2015, pursuant to Pub.

L. 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1813. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, for the period of October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to Pub. L. 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1814. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures for the 2015 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whiting [Docket No.: 14129999-5432-02] (RIN: 0648-BE74) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1815. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North and South Atlantic 2015 Commercial Swordfish Quotas [Docket No.: 150116050-5375-02] (RIN: 0648-XD726) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1816. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Aleutian Islands Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XD920) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1817. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 140918791-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-XD908) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1818. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Blacktip Sharks, Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks, and Hammerhead Sharks in the Gulf of Mexico Region [Docket No.: 140429387-4971-02] (RIN: 0648-XD911) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1819. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Gray Triggerfish [Docket No.: 120815345-3525-02] (RIN: 0648-XD901) received June 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1820. A letter from the Controller, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, transmitting the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution's Audited Financial Statements for the years

ended December 31, 2014 and 2013, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1102, Pub. L. 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 160. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices; with an amendment (Rept. 114-147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1615. A bill to direct the Chief FOIA Officer of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in the implementation of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1637. A bill to require annual reports on the activities and accomplishments of federally funded research and development centers within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-149). 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. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2728. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 2729. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce to establish public-private partnerships under the Market Development Cooperator Program of the International Trade Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2730. A bill to establish the National Prostate Cancer Council for improved screening, early detection, assessment, and monitoring of prostate cancer, and to direct the development and implementation of a national strategic plan to expedite advancement of diagnostic tools and the transfer of such tools to patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KATKO, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2731. A bill to amend section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide increased accountability of nonprofit ath-

letic associations and to establish a commission to identify and examine issues of national concern related to the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. ESTY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 2732. A bill to provide for a grant program for handgun licensing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself and Mr. HARDY):

H.R. 2733. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARTON (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 2734. A bill to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to extend, enhance, and revise the provisions relating to collection, use, and disclosure of personal information of children, to establish certain other protections for personal information of children and minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 2735. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require establishment of objective numerical recovery goals for removal of species from lists of endangered species and threatened species under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2736. A bill to provide for a Youth Mental Health Research Network; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TAKAI, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2737. 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; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 2738. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to encourage and facilitate efforts by States and other transportation rights-of-way managers to adopt integrated vegetation management practices, including enhancing plantings of native forbs and grasses that provide habitats and forage for Monarch butterflies, native bees, and other native pollinators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DENT, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 2739. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for coverage of oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the coverage provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. ESTY, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BEYER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BERA, Mr. LOBSACK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BASS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SIREs, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HIMES, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 2740. A bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2741. A bill to provide a short-term disability insurance program for Federal employees for disabilities that are not work-related, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2742. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that military working dogs be retired in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2743. A bill to reauthorize the Hydrographic Services Improvement Act of 1998, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 2744. A bill to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SCHAROWSKY, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H. Res. 309. A resolution recognizing June 19, 2015, as this year's observance of the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 2730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 2732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 2733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BARTON:

H.R. 2734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 2735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I, section 8, clause 3, that grants Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 2736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the United States Congress shall have power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes".

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 2738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 2739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This states that, "Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:
H.R. 2743.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:
H.R. 2744.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, §8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Ms. NORTON, Mr. DOLD, Mr. TURNER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SALMON, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 21: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 207: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 320: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 465: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 472: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 511: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 539: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 563: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 592: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 628: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 662: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 680: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 690: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 692: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 702: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 711: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 766: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 823: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 825: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 845: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 850: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 879: Mr. PITTENGER and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 881: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 918: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 921: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 923: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 952: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 985: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 986: Mr. TURNER and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 999: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1192: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1197: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1202: Ms. BORDALLO and Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 1209: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FARR, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1247: Mr. SIREN.
H.R. 1301: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1310: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1312: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1321: Mr. HONDA, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1344: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1388: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1411: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1413: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1427: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. MENG, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1462: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1475: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1490: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1500: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1528: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1545: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1553: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 1610: Mr. FLORES, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1624: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1632: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 1650: Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 1670: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1683: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1684: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1692: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1742: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 1767: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1768: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1786: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1832: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1854: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1919: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1941: Mr. KLINE and Ms. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1942: Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1950: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 1974: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1977: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1994: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2017: Mr. BARTON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BARR, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2043: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2050: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2076: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2128: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 2132: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2193: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2216: Mr. POCAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2218: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 2233: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2236: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2295: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2296: Mr. PETERS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2300: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2311: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 2342: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2397: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2400: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 2403: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2404: Ms. MOORE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2406: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2450: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2494: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2518: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2523: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2530: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2545: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2555: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2571: Mr. RUSH, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 2590: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2627: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2646: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2647: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 2650: Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 2675: Mr. POSEY and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2689: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2692: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2694: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. FARR, and Mr. GALLEGGO.
H.R. 2698: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 2716: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. PITTENGER.
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. GALLEGGO.
H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. WALZ, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. DENT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. PITTENGER.
H. Res. 12: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 28: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H. Res. 54: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
H. Res. 210: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H. Res. 214: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MOORE, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. NOLAN.
H. Res. 232: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 294: Mr. HONDA.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

12. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners, relative to Resolution No. R-455-15, urging Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 47, or similar legislation, supporting the establishment of a Presidential Youth Council; and urging President Obama's administration to establish a Presidential Youth Council; which was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 31: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. 2. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a flash-bang grenade under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.

H.R. 2685

OFFERED BY: MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 32: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer a mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2015

No. 93

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, in this quiet moment, may a holy hush come over us, giving us a sense of our dependence on You. May our Senators not trust too much in their abilities to solve problems and meet challenges but continue to seek the eternal and transcendent resources You offer to people of faith.

Lord, give our lawmakers humble and contrite hearts, that they may be channels of light and truth. Uphold them with Your everlasting and uplifting arms. May they persevere with integrity so that they may be presented holy and unblameable in Your sight. Keep our Senators calm and filled with faith in spite of all they must face.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The majority leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES BILLINGTON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we have recently learned that Dr. James Billington, the Librarian of Congress, who has been with us for almost 30 years, will be retiring in January. He

plans to spend more time with his wife of nearly 58 years, Marjorie. He wants to see more of his 4 children and 12 grandchildren. I am sure he would also like to catch up with his buddy who plays for the Grateful Dead or maybe just sit back with a box or two of the Mallomars he loves so much.

But I don't think Dr. Billington is ready to take his scholar's cap off quite yet, because he is preparing to do a little writing, too, about folks who played an important role in the history of—what else—the Library that means so much to him.

Dr. Billington has called the Library of Congress the “greatest collection of knowledge and copyrighted creativity in human history,” and I know how proud he is of the many initiatives he has undertaken to expand its reach and its relevance.

I noted yesterday that we are unlikely to come across many guys who can say they have been a Princeton valedictorian, a Harvard professor, an expert on the Kremlin, a veteran, and a Rhodes Scholar. But that is our Librarian of Congress.

He speaks 7 languages, he has 42 honorary doctorates, and I am hoping he will soon be able to start catching a full 8 hours of sleep every night.

Dr. Billington has certainly earned it, and we wish him the very best in his retirement.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on a different matter, I think a lot of people were shocked to hear that the Obama administration was unable to prevent the information of 4 million Americans from being compromised by hackers.

Officials in the White House now owe it to every American to let Congress help them get out of the past and up to speed with the cyber security realities of the 21st century. That is just what the measure we will soon consider would help do.

It contains modern tools that cyber security experts tell us could help deter future attacks against both the public and the private sectors. The measure would also help get the word out faster about attacks as soon as they are detected, provide governments and businesses with knowledge they can use to erect stronger defenses, and help strike a critical balance between security and privacy in the process. The bill would do so, for instance, by mandating the creation of guidelines to limit the use, retention, and diffusion of consumers' personal information.

This is more than just a smart measure. It is a transparent one too. It has been carefully scrutinized by Senators from both parties. It has been endorsed overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis by nearly every single Democrat and every single Republican on the Intelligence Committee, and it has been posted online and available for anyone to read for quite some time.

The need for this smart, bipartisan, transparent measure couldn't be clearer. We shouldn't wait for the administration to fumble away another 4 million Social Security numbers or personal addresses before we help them get modernized and up to speed.

That hasn't stopped some Democratic leaders from thinking they should try to score some political points by taking down a bipartisan measure to combat cyber attacks.

I hope they won't do that.

Most Americans would find it awfully cynical for Democratic leaders, in the wake of the administration's inability to stop such a massive cyber attack, to vote against the very same cyber security legislation their own party vetted and overwhelmingly endorsed in committee for the sake of scoring some kind of political point.

We have a smart, transparent, bipartisan, fully vetted measure before us that can help make our country safer.

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4063

Senators in both parties have a chance to offer other amendments to the bill and amend it, too.

My hope now is that we can work together to help pass a measure that is in support of the American people and backed by a broad coalition of supporters—everyone from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the U.S. Telecom Association. The sooner we do, the sooner we can conference it with two similar White House-backed bills that passed the House, and the sooner we can finally get a good cyber security law on the books to help protect Americans.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, that brings me then to the larger debate the Senate is having this week. The bill the cyber measure has been offered to is the annual Defense authorization Act. It is a related issue. It is about protecting our country. It makes sense to consider these issues together.

Now, the Defense bill is another measure that should be sailing to passage with strong bipartisan support. It does so almost every year. But Democratic leaders now seem to have a different idea.

Here is a headline that just appeared in the Washington Post: "Democrats prepare for filibuster summer."

"Democrats prepare for filibuster summer." We can already feel Americans just tense up. They don't even like the sound of it. Who would?

Let me read just a few lines from that story: "After almost six months in the minority . . . Senate Democrats aren't afraid to be obstructionists, detailing a strategy of blocking appropriations bills and other Republican agenda items until they get what they want"—"until they get what they want."

"Get ready for filibuster summer," the Post warned, because despite opening themselves "to charges of hypocrisy," Democrats have "decided to block all spending bills starting with the defense appropriations measure."

Putting the obvious hypocrisy aside, one thing is clear: The party leaders opposite seem to think this is all just a game.

Democratic leaders seem to think the pay raise for a soldier who gives everything to protect our country and who would give anything to provide for her kids isn't something she has earned, but something she can gamble with in a high-stakes game of "Shutdown Roulette."

Democratic leaders don't seem the least bit bothered by the dire national security implications of what they are doing. They have packed the car for their filibuster vacation, and they are ready to hit the road, whatever the consequences for our country. They are heading down this road at a time when "the United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of World War II."

Those are the words of Henry Kissinger. And he is right. From Beijing, Moscow, and the tribal areas of Pakistan, to Ramadi and Tehran, we see unrest and global threats that threaten American values and American interests.

And what do we see from Democratic leaders? A serious plan?

We hear the President telling us he still doesn't even have one when it comes to confronting one of our most serious challenges—ISIL.

This is 8 months after he announced his intention to confront this threat. This is 8 months after I and others called on the President to provide us with a comprehensive plan to defeat this menace. And it is 8 months since I pledged that Congress would work with the administration to ensure our forces have the resources they need to carry out their missions.

Republicans have kept up our end of the bargain, even if the President still doesn't have a serious plan.

The President asked us for \$612 billion in his budget request to Congress. That is what he asked for. So we worked across the aisle to craft a bipartisan Defense authorization bill at precisely that level. He asked. We delivered.

The House version of this bill already passed by a big bipartisan margin. The Senate version sailed out of the Armed Services Committee on a vote of 22 to 4. We were all set to pass the very type of bill President Obama indicated he wanted, but then Democratic leaders started listening to that little partisan pat on their shoulder: Why not take this opportunity to pump up that unrelated government spending we like so much? Just threaten to filibuster pay raises for the troops until they shower more cash on the bureaucrats in Washington.

At a moment of grave and gathering threats, Democrats listened to that partisan voice—that partisan voice.

At a time when our military families need all the support they can get, Democratic leaders reverted to partisan form and are now threatening to blow up a bipartisan bill.

I would think this would be of some concern to commonsense Democrats. They have to be wondering if their leaders have totally lost it—completely lost it—with this filibuster summer and holding our military hostage.

We don't have to look too far to see the important role the military plays in each of our communities. I mentioned yesterday how important Fort Campbell is to Kentucky. Let me now tell my colleagues a little bit about Fort Knox.

Fort Knox hosts the Army's Human Resources Command. It is a hub for multiple major commands under the Training and Doctrine Command. Because of its vast array of excellent training grounds and exceptional training facilities, Fort Knox also recently began hosting thousands of cadets for

extensive annual training under the Army Leader's Training Course. Not only has Fort Knox been leading the Army in energy independence by developing the capability to go off the grid entirely, but it also continues to make an exceptionally important contribution locally, as well.

Fort Knox's economic impact on Hardin County and the surrounding communities stands at over \$2 billion a year. My constituents in Elizabethtown and across the Commonwealth know how important Fort Knox is to our community and to our country. They also know that passing the bipartisan Defense bill before us would allow for a critical new medical facility to be built at Fort Knox. They don't want to see Democratic leaders hold that medical facility hostage for unrelated partisan reasons.

Kentuckians and Americans know that supporting our troops is never ever a waste of time. They know that ensuring the military has the tools it needs isn't a game. Here is something else so many of our constituents know: What America needs right now is not a summer of filibusters but a season of serious bipartisan solutions. That is what the Defense bill before us represents, and that is what this new Congress has been doing all year. We have gotten a lot done. There is a lot more we can do. And if rank-and-file Democrats reject their leader's partisan games in favor of keeping up the bipartisan work that got us to this point instead—on a bill they joined Republicans to pass in committee 22 to 4—then that is just the kind of productive summer we can keep working toward.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES BILLINGTON

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I admire and appreciate very much my friend the Republican leader mentioning Dr. James Billington, a friend of mine.

I had a wonderful conversation with Dr. Billington yesterday. I wrote him a nice letter talking about what we have done together over these past three decades.

It seems only yesterday that I was chairman of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee and a new Senator here. One of the first attacks we got from Republicans at that time was to whack the Library of Congress. They even went after the magazines that were produced in braille. I can remember the debate we had about Playboy magazine. I don't know what they were trying to eliminate, but they tried. I don't know what they could do with the braille in a Playboy magazine. But we were able to turn that back.

I so appreciate this good man and what he has done. His academic record

is terrific. As a person, he is the best. We have traveled parts of the world with him, together with Mark Hatfield, a Republican, who was one of the Republican leaders of the Senate, and I was a junior Senator at the time. We had a great trip. Prior to coming to the Library of Congress, Jim Billington was the acting leader of our country on the Soviet Union. He is a wonderful man, and I ask that my remarks indicate that I agree with every word the Republican leader said about Jim Billington.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend the Republican leader threw around words such as “cynicism” and “hypocrisy.” This speech my friend gave—I would suggest he walk into his office, his little bathroom in there, and look into that mirror because over that mirror he should be able to see the words “hypocrisy” and “cynicism” because the speech he gave was fervent with hypocrisy and cynicism.

We have tried very hard since the first of the year to cooperate with the Republicans, and we have done it. On this bill which is before us now, the Defense authorization bill—it is a bill I will talk about a little later in more detail—this is a piece of legislation which the President said before it left the committee was going to be vetoed. He not only said it, he put it in writing. We cooperated. We allowed it to go on the floor without the normal filibuster and the motion to proceed that I had to approach when I led the Senate as the majority leader hundreds of times—hundreds of times. So we have cooperated. We haven’t filibustered getting on the bill, as I mentioned, and we have allowed amendments to get pending and get votes. That is something the Republicans would not let us do when this bill came up the last 2 years. It is a major bill.

The Republican leader said a couple years ago, and I quote, “The Defense authorization bill requires 4 or 5 weeks to debate.” That is what he said.

So this work that he has done on this Defense authorization bill is just the height of hypocrisy and cynicism. He comes to the floor today and blames Barack Obama for the hacking that the Chinese did. He talks about what a great bill we have. He stuck on this bill the cyber security—for 5 years we tried to get up a cyber security bill. Every time we brought it up, it was stopped by the Republicans. Every time. I met in my office 5 years ago with five different committee chairs, and they moved forward to try to get a bill out. Every step of the way, my Republican friends blocked us. So talk about cynicism, hypocrisy.

On the Defense bill they talk about what a gift they gave to the President. They gave a gift to the President of \$39 billion more deficit spending. That is more deficit spending on the overseas

contingency fund. They refused to allow that on virtually everything else.

My friend the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, in years past and, in fact, when this bill first came from the House, complained about this phony gimmick they were using, but now my friend, with whom I came to Congress 33 years ago, suddenly likes this bill. I don’t know how he can do the backflip he did to come to this reasoning.

There is no better example of the dysfunction created by the Republican leader and his party than what we have seen not in the last 5½ months, the last 24 hours. Think about what he has done. We are on the Defense authorization bill that the President said out loud and in writing he is going to veto. Everyone knows that. Every Republican knows that. But the Republican leader is hell-bent on moving forward with this cynical ploy to pass a bill that is destined to be vetoed.

Yesterday, he even went further and intimidated that Republicans love the defense of this country through our military and we don’t. At that time, I said, and I repeat, every one of my Democratic Senators is a patriot. They believe in this country, and they support the military. So supporting the military isn’t a lock that the Republicans have.

To make matters worse, the Republican leader is now using this bill which should be focused on funding our troops to pull these diverting, deceitful ploys on cyber security. On cyber security, with the Republican leader’s blessing, Senators BURR and MCCAIN employed a rarely used device to get a cyber security amendment pending with no agreement, and then, before any action was taken, the Republican leader quickly filed cloture.

When the Senate considered the 2012 cyber security bill—and we tried so hard to get that out—Senator MCCONNELL complained about cloture being filed too quickly, which I did because they wouldn’t let us move at all on the bill.

In 2012, Senator MCCONNELL said:

The few days the bill was on the floor, the majority limited its consideration to debate only and then . . . filed cloture. But, of course, that is kind of par for the course around here. . . . The notion that we should just roll over and wave through these bills without having a chance to improve them and that Democratic Senators would be willing to be rolled in such a way is ridiculous, especially on a bill of this significance.

Yet, here the Republican leader is doing just what he lambasted before. Now, that really is par for the course over these last 5 months.

For 6 years, in three different Congresses, virtually everything President Obama tried to do and we tried to do was filibustered. That is no secret. Hundreds of times—hundreds of times on motions to proceed, gobbling up 30 hours here, 2 days here. Hundreds of times.

So now what we find is something that to me is even more troubling.

There have been press reports today that Republicans on the House side are involved in a vote-buying scheme on the trade bill by promising never to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. They are saying to these few Republicans: If you vote to allow us to go forward with this trade bill, we won’t do anything on the Export-Import Bank. What a shame.

Let me get this straight. Republicans want to pass a trade bill that hurts American workers, and in order to buy votes to make that happen, they are going to kill 165,000 more jobs by letting Ex-Im Bank lapse. The number of Americans working today because of the Bank, as we speak today, is 165,000.

Another part of this cynical ploy unfolded here on the Senate floor. The Republican leader, who is intent on letting the Export-Import Bank lapse, allowed a token vote on the measure to try to appease the Bank’s supporters. The Republican leader immediately walks out in the last 24 hours and files an amendment on Ex-Im Bank and within hours files a motion to table the amendment. Wow.

So we should not be easily fooled, and we are not. If the Bank expires, there is no telling how long it will take to renew it—if, in fact, it ever happens. None should be fooled by these sham votes. If we want to preserve the Bank, we should vote to extend it before it expires on June 30 this year—in a couple weeks.

I am amazed it is even an issue. It wasn’t that long ago that Republicans believed that this Bank was good for America. Republican Presidents believed in it—Reagan, Bush, and Bush.

I remember when the Republican leader was in favor of the Bank. In 1997, the Senator from Kentucky cosponsored legislation reauthorizing the Bank’s charter. With Senator MCCONNELL’s help, the Senate passed that bill unanimously. That is the way we used to do it because it was so good for America. Again, 4 years later, the Republican leader signed on to a letter encouraging George W. Bush to extend the Bank’s charter, which, of course, he did. At that time, he and 29 other Republican Senators argued that allowing the Bank to lapse would be devastating to the economy and in particular our trade deficit. Now the senior Senator from Kentucky has turned a legislative backflip and today wants the Bank to disappear. Talk about hypocrisy. Talk about cynicism. Wow. As he continues to remind everyone, he sets the schedule around here. Yet, he cannot be bothered to schedule a vote on the Export-Import Bank before it lapses.

So what changed? Here is what changed. The Republican leader is not the only Republican performing a breathtaking about-face on this issue. The chairman of the banking committee supported the Export-Import Bank as recently as a year or two ago. In fact, the senior Senator from Alabama supported a 4-year renewal. If the

Senator from Alabama had gotten his way, the Bank would still have a year left before the charter expired. But now the senior Senator from Alabama, speaking on the Bank's reauthorization, said, "I believe at the end of the day if it expires, we won't miss it." Tell that to 165,000 people who will lose their jobs. Just last night, the banking committee chairman tried to table an amendment reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank. That motion failed overwhelmingly and displayed that the Bank has a lot of support for reauthorization.

I don't mean to point a finger at just the Republican leader and the banking committee chairman. Many other Senate Republicans have flipped on this also and so quickly that I am sure their heads are spinning even as we speak.

To understand the Republican change of position, one need only look—where do we look? What do the Koch brothers want us to do? What do the Koch brothers want us to do? These Koch brothers are their billionaire benefactors. Charles and David Koch adamantly oppose the Export-Import Bank today but not yesterday. They were not always against the Bank.

Just like most other businesses in America, Koch Industries is always looking for new markets for its goods. They should. That means the Koch brothers are all for exports. How could they not be? After all, the Koch brothers got into business by selling services to Joseph Stalin. That is where they got started—Joseph Stalin and his brutal Communist Soviet Union.

More recently, Koch Industries and its subsidiaries have used the Export-Import Bank to find an international marketplace for their goods. The Hill newspaper reports that Koch companies Georgia-Pacific, John Zink, Molex, and Koch Heat Transfer, among others, received over \$16 million in loans from the Bank. That is what the Bank is intended for. That \$16 million is to help sustain American jobs.

But it is stunningly hypocritical that the same Koch brothers are using the Bank for loans they could literally write a check for and that they are attacking as a corporate giveaway. This reminds me of the time the Kochs attacked ObamaCare as collectivism. They probably know a little bit about it. That is where their business started. The Kochs attacked ObamaCare as collectivism, while collecting health subsidies through the Affordable Care Act. Talk about cynicism. Talk about hypocrisy.

Now, after benefiting from the Export-Import Bank, the Koch brothers figure we have it all. Why should we try to help anybody else? We are multi-billionaires. That is an understatement. They are labeling it "corporate welfare" and "a handout" for big business. I wonder if Charles and David got whiplash from their extreme turnaround. The Kochs' main political arm, Americans for Prosperity, is now lead-

ing an all-out assault on the Bank. It is going to great lengths to pressure Republicans to let the Bank's charter lapse.

It is one thing for a couple of oil baron billionaires to oppose a program for their own financial purposes; it is an entirely different thing for governing Republicans in Congress to do their bidding. But obviously that is what is happening. Why else the turnaround? Republicans in Congress were for the Export-Import Bank until the Kochs were against it. Now Republicans are running for cover, waiting to find a way that they can try to rationalize not being for it, when they were for it before.

One conservative news outlet run by the Heritage Foundation went so far as to report that Republican Presidential hopefuls have to reject the Export-Import Bank if they want the Koch's endorsement and financial backing. You cannot make up stuff better than this. The Daily Signal, for example, reports, "An endorsement would likely turn on a candidate's approach to one or more issues of importance to the Koch brothers, beginning with their opposition to the Federal Export-Import Bank."

It would be tragic if the Export-Import Bank was not reauthorized because Republicans with White House ambitions or Senators who are afraid they are going to get a primary here in the Senate are more interested in auditioning for the Koch brothers, as Presidential candidates are and Republican leaders in Congress do. They go meet with them a couple times a year to make sure they bow when they are supposed to and don't crowd and make sure they are called upon when they are asked to.

The Republican leader and his colleagues have completely altered their position on a program that supports 165,000 American jobs, jobs here right in our country, many in their own States. Every State in the Union benefits. Republicans have changed their opinion on a bank that has returned \$7 billion to the Treasury, our Treasury. It is a flip that would make a trapeze artist cringe.

I say to my Republican friends: Just because the Koch brothers tell you to jump, do you have to say: Well, how high do you want me to jump? We do not have much time. The Export-Import Bank charter expires at the end of this month. Last night's vote proves there is support in this Chamber to reauthorize this Bank. Sixty-five Senators voted in support of it last night. So I urge Senate Republicans to put aside their nonsensical backtracking on a program they themselves admitted was a job creator and understand where the real cynicism and hypocrisy lies in this Chamber.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Utah.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last month, the Senate passed the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, which renews trade promotion authority or TPA. Years of hard work and compromise enabled us to pass this bill with strong bipartisan support in the Senate. Now with the Senate having already acted, all of our eyes are turned to the House of Representatives, where I know the Speaker and the Republican leadership, not to mention the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, who is the coauthor of the bill, are working to move this important bill forward.

I want to take some time to address some of the concerns I have heard from our House colleagues and others about this bill and the concept of TPA, in general. For example, I know some have claimed that TPA cedes too much congressional authority to the executive branch. This is a particularly troublesome proposition for some of my Republican House colleagues who might be wary of granting new powers to the current occupant of the White House.

Now, let me be clear. I have spent as much time as anyone in Congress criticizing President Obama's Executive overreach. I have come to the floor numerous times to catalog all the ways the current administration has overstepped its authority on issues ranging from health care to immigration, to labor policy. In fact, I was here just yesterday talking about efforts on the part of the administration to unilaterally undermine welfare reform.

So when people say they are worried about legislation that would take power from Congress and give it to this President, believe me, I understand. I would worry about that, too, but that is not what our TPA legislation does. Simply put, TPA is a compact between the House, the Senate, and the administration.

With TPA in place, the administration agrees to pursue negotiating objectives established by Congress and is required to consult with Congress on a regular basis during the whole negotiating process. In return, the House and Senate agree to vote on any trade agreement that meets those requirements under a specified timeline without amendments. The President does not have any new powers under this compact and Congress does not give up any powers.

In fact, the primary purpose of TPA is to enhance Congress's role in the negotiating process. That is right. Despite some claims that TPA is an abrogation of congressional power, the opposite is actually true. Without TPA, the Members of Congress and their constituents have no strong voice on establishing our trade priorities. With TPA, Congress can define trade negotiating objectives and priorities.

Without TPA, the administration is under no formal obligation to provide Congress with meaningful information on the status of ongoing trade negotiations. With TPA, Congress can require the administration to provide frequent updates and consultations. For example, the Senate-passed TPA bill will ensure that any Member of Congress who wants access to the negotiating text, at any time during the negotiations, will get that access.

In addition, Members of Congress will, once again at any time, be able to request and receive a briefing from the USTR, the U.S. Trade Representative, on the current status of ongoing trade negotiations. In other words, TPA gives Congress a much stronger say in the substance of our country's trade negotiations and provides mechanisms to hold the administration far more accountable.

Right now, the Obama administration is negotiating trade agreements with only ad hoc and informal direction from Congress. That will change once Congress renews TPA. Still, I know there are some who believe that by agreeing not to allow amendments or filibusters of trade agreements, Congress is giving up most of its power to influence trade agreements on the back end once an agreement is actually signed.

Again, let me be clear. Under TPA, Congress at all times—all times—maintains the ultimate authority over a trade agreement, the power to reject it entirely. TPA does not guarantee the passage of any trade agreement now or in the future, nor does it, as some have argued, reduce votes in Congress to a "rubberstamp" for the administration.

This is important, as there has been some confusion on this point. With the coming vote on TPA, the House of Representatives is not voting to approve any individual trade agreement. I know pundits and talking heads in the media have tried to conflate passage of TPA with Congress's approval of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, but in reality these are separate and distinct propositions.

Case in point: Over the last couple of years, I have been the most outspoken advocate in Congress in favor of renewing TPA. However, throughout that time, I have made it abundantly clear that my support for TPA does not guarantee any support for the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Indeed, I am fully prepared to vote against the TPP if the administration falls short on reaching high-priority negotiating objectives. Many on this side of the aisle and on

the other side of the aisle have informed them of some of these high-priority negotiating objectives.

But even if maintaining the power to accept or reject the trade agreement is not enough, the Senate-passed TPA bill contains procedures, including an all-new procedure that will enable Congress to strip procedural protections from any trade agreement if it determines there was inadequate consultation or that the negotiating objectives have not been met.

Additionally, under the bill, both the House and the Senate maintain their constitutional prerogative to change their respective rules to override TPA. So as you can see, the Congress has not given up any of its powers under TPA. In addition to preserving and enhancing Congress's role in trade policy, the Senate-passed TPA bill contains a number of provisions that actually constrain the administration as it negotiates and implements new trade agreements.

For example, the bill ensures that implementing bills to trade agreements will include—and I am quoting the text of the bill here—"only such provisions as are strictly necessary or appropriate to implement" trade agreements. Additionally, the bill makes clear that any commitments made by the administration that are not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill for an agreement is introduced will not be considered as part of the agreement and will have no force of law.

Furthermore, the bill also ensures that trade agreements cannot be used to undermine U.S. sovereignty, another concern I have heard about TPA and one I wanted to make sure we were protecting against. The bill accomplishes this goal in four important ways; first, it makes clear that any provision of the trade agreement that is inconsistent with Federal or State law will have no effect; second, the bill states specifically that Federal and State laws will prevail in the event of a conflict with the trade agreement; third, it affirms that no trade agreement can prevent Congress or the States from changing their laws in the future; fourth, it confirms that the administration cannot unilaterally change U.S. law.

All of these provisions have been drafted with an eye toward maintaining the separation of powers and ensuring that no administration can use trade agreements to unilaterally write U.S. laws or policy. Now, we have all heard claims that the President intends to use trade agreements to change our immigration laws or enact strict climate change standards. TPA ensures that throughout the process of negotiating, finalizing, and approving a trade agreement, Congress stays in the driver's seat.

Finally, I want to address the concerns I have heard about the supposed secrecy surrounding the TPP agreement. Some of our House colleagues, as

well as a number of people in the media, have decried the fact that details of the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, have not yet been made public. They have also argued that by renewing the TPA before the details of the deal are disclosed, Congress would be enabling further secrecy. Again, this reflects a simple misunderstanding of simple negotiation tactics.

The TPP is still being negotiated. As with any high-stakes negotiation, some level of confidentiality is a must if we are going to get the best deal possible with 11 other countries at the table.

In all sensitive negotiations, there is a time for disclosure and a time to hold your cards close to your chest. So I recognize that with trade negotiations, our government is negotiating on behalf of the American people. We need to ensure that the maximum amount of transparency is possible.

Fortunately, the Senate-passed TPA bill strikes an appropriate balance to deal with these issues, providing unprecedented levels of transparency and oversight into the trade-negotiating process. Under our bill, the full text of a completed trade agreement must be made public at least 60 days before the President can even sign it—be made public at least 60 days before the President can even sign it. Talk about transparency—this is an all-new requirement, giving the American people new and unprecedented access and knowledge of all trade agreements well before they are even submitted to the Congress for approval.

After that 60-day period has expired and the President signs an agreement, he must submit to Congress the legal text of the trade agreement and a Statement of Administrative Action at least 30 days before formally submitting an implementing the bill. As I noted earlier, the bill includes all-new requirements giving Members of Congress access to text and information throughout the negotiating process.

Any Member of the House of Representatives that supports free trade who is concerned about the secrecy of current negotiations should be the first in line to support the Senate-passed TPA bill. Once again, any supporters of expanded U.S. exports who are also wary of executive overreach should be trumpeting their support for our bill.

The Senate TPA bill enhances Congress's role in trade negotiations. The Senate TPA bill maintains Congress's power to accept or reject any future trade agreement. The Senate TPA bill prevents the President from pursuing unilateral changes to U.S. law or policy. And the Senate TPA bill provides unprecedented levels of transparency and oversight into these trade agreements or into any trade agreements that may come forward, including TPP.

I am sure that some of the cynics out there have one more question: If TPA imposes all of these requirements and restrictions on the administration, why does the President want it so badly?

The answer to that question is simple. TPA is necessary in order for our negotiators to get a good deal. We know this is the case. Without TPA in place, our negotiating partners have no guarantees that the deal they sign will be one Congress will consider.

Without those guarantees, they are less likely to put their best offers on the table because they will have no assurance that our country can deliver on the deal or any deal they enter into with us. Make no mistake, we need to get good deals at the negotiating table.

More than 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of our country, the United States. If our farmers, manufacturers, and entrepreneurs are going to compete on the world stage, they need access to these customers.

History has shown that high-standard free-trade agreements expand market access for U.S. exporters and reduce our trade deficits. Most importantly, they grow our economy, create good, high-paying jobs for workers here at home, and improve living standards for our citizens and for our trading partners. If the United States is going to advance its values and interests in the international marketplace, we need to be writing the rules and setting the standards. We cannot do that if we are sitting on the sidelines.

This is an important bill. I was very pleased to see it pass the Senate with bipartisan support.

I hope that in the coming days, we will see a similar result in the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

KING V. BURWELL

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we expect a ruling this month in the Supreme Court case of King v. Burwell, which will have such an impact on families all across America and on the affordability and availability of health insurance for them and for their families. This is an incredibly important issue.

As someone who was there in the Senate Finance Committee at virtually every meeting—and who helped write the tax credit section of the bill—I wish to remind my colleagues of what is at stake in this decision.

During the Finance Committee markups, I worked very hard to make sure the affordability tax credits, which provide tax cuts for millions of Americans, were meaningful in helping people buy health insurance through the marketplaces. It took a lot of work to get those tax credits written into the Affordable Care Act. In fact, as my colleagues know, certainly on this side of the aisle, I would go to every meeting with charts and graphs, looking at what people would have to pay under various levels of tax cuts and how to make sure it was affordable. The great news is that the majority of Americans today are able to purchase affordable

health insurance for less than \$100 a month, and that was a lot of work to get done. That is really what is at stake right now.

Now, I know there are people who don't like the law that was written, but the legal argument being presented in the Supreme Court right now makes absolutely no sense. Folks on the Republican side of the aisle are asking the Supreme Court to raise the taxes of some 6.4 million Americans. We are talking about \$1.7 billion in tax increases going to all these States in the red, including my own.

We have Members of the Senate cheering on a court that could rule that there would be a \$1.7 billion tax increase on their own constituents. Don't count me in as one of those who are cheering that on. I don't understand it.

These Members of Congress are effectively saying that people in Massachusetts, where there is a State exchange, can have a tax cut and the affordable coverage that comes with it, but people in Oklahoma can't have a tax cut. They are suggesting it is fine for people who live in the District of Columbia to get tax cuts to help pay for their insurance, but people in Louisiana cannot or that people in New York can have tax cuts to help pay for their insurance, but people in Texas cannot.

Now, to drive this point home, I wish to take a moment to look at how many people in each State are at risk of a tax increase based on the Supreme Court ruling, because this is very important to literally millions and millions of Americans.

In Alabama the Supreme Court could raise taxes through their decision on 132,253 people. Over 132,000 people will find out this month whether they get a tax increase as a result of the Supreme Court decision.

In Alaska, we see the possibility of 16,583 people in the Last Frontier State who would see an average of \$536 more in taxes as a result of the possible decision being urged on by Republicans in the House and Senate.

In Arizona, the Grand Canyon State, over 126,000 people—Americans—would see a tax increase. There would be \$20 million total in tax increases in Arizona, depending on how the Supreme Court rules.

Let's go on to what is called the Natural State, Arkansas, where 48,100 people will see an average increase of \$284 as a result of the Supreme Court decision if they rule against what we know was done correctly in terms of writing the Affordable Care Act.

Let's go on and look at Delaware, the First State, where 19,128 people would see their taxes go up—a tax increase in Delaware, depending on what the Supreme Court does later this month.

In Florida, the Sunshine State, it is over 1.3 million people—1,324,516 people—and we are looking at almost \$390 million in tax increases that would be coming from the State of Florida if the Supreme Court sides with Republicans

and makes that decision that will increase people's taxes.

In Georgia, the Peach State, 412,385 Georgians will see a tax increase as a result of the Supreme Court if the Supreme Court does what the Republicans want to have done.

In Illinois, 232,371 people living in Illinois, next to Michigan, our great friends in Illinois—almost \$50 million in tax increases in Illinois will happen beginning at the end of this month if the Supreme Court rules the way Republicans want them to rule.

In Indiana, also next to the great State of Michigan, 159,802 people living in Indiana, Hoosiers, will see their taxes go up if the Supreme Court rules against providing tax cuts.

In Iowa, the Hawkeye State, 34,172 Iowans will see their taxes go up. These are families. These are working families. These are families working hard, with one job, maybe two jobs, maybe three jobs. There probably are folks who are certainly included in this who lost the equity in their homes after what happened with the great recession and are trying to dig themselves out of the hole and are celebrating the fact that they can go to bed at night not having to worry if the kids get sick, if they can take them to the doctor. Most of them are able to buy health insurance for less than \$100 a month because of the tax cuts we passed in the Affordable Care Act.

In Kansas, the Sunflower State, 69,979 people—almost 70,000 people in Kansas—will see their taxes go up if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position on the Affordable Care Act.

In Louisiana, the Pelican State, 137,940 people who live in Louisiana—almost \$45 million would come out of this State in tax increases if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position regarding the Affordable Care Act.

In Maine there are 60,939 people who represent families—people who have families, who have children, spouses—who are now able to afford insurance, most of them for under \$100 a month, maybe for the first time ever because of the tax cuts, tax credits that are translated into tax cuts for people in the Affordable Care Act.

This one means the most to me, of course, and that is my home State of Michigan. There is no way, by the way, I would have ever voted to do this. The idea that we voted for something that would make all of this happen is pretty crazy. Obviously, that was not legislative intent. But in Michigan, 228,388 people in my State, men and women and their children, will, in fact, see a tax increase if the Supreme Court rules with the Republican position at the end of this month.

Missouri, the Show Me State: Well, I will tell you what they don't want to show are more tax increases—197,663 people in Missouri, and we are talking about \$55 million coming out of the State of Missouri. These are families

who will pay more and, in many cases, not be able to afford health care anymore for their families. So they are going to pay more, and they are not going to have health care.

Mississippi, the Magnolia State: There are 75,613 people. That State will see over \$26 million in total tax increases.

Montana, the Treasure State: 41,766 people in Montana. It is close to \$10 million in total that will come out of Montana, from Montana families, in tax increases, if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position in the House and the Senate and raises people's taxes.

Nebraska: 56,910 Nebraskans will see their taxes go up an average of \$257 each—almost \$15 million in total coming from Nebraska.

New Hampshire: The Supreme Court decision could raise taxes on almost 30,000 people—29,996 people—in New Hampshire who have health insurance now, most for under \$100 a month. They will probably lose their health care and the bonus is they will get a tax increase that will, in total, be almost \$8 million.

New Jersey, the Garden State: 172,345 people in New Jersey are all looking at about \$54 million in tax increases—this is New Jersey alone—who will get less health care and more taxes.

North Carolina, the Tar Heel State: 458,738 people. That is a lot of people in North Carolina—458,738 people—who today have the peace of mind of knowing if they get sick, they can go to a doctor, take their children to the doctor, they can prevent themselves from getting sick by having preventive care and cancer screenings and all those things we want for ourselves and our families. They will see their taxes go up if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position.

North Dakota: 14,115 individuals will see their taxes go up. We are looking at \$3.3 million in small States such as North Dakota where families will pay an increase in taxes.

Ohio: 161,011 people in Ohio. The Buckeye State—the great rivals of my State. There are 161,011 Ohioans who are looking at \$41 million in total tax increases. They are looking at less health care and more taxes if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position sometime between now and the end of the month.

The Sooner State of Oklahoma: 87,136 people living in Oklahoma. This is another State near and dear to me. This is where my mom grew up. She lived on a farm and actually picked cotton. I know how hard they work. So 87,136 people in Oklahoma will see over \$18 million come from this State. These are men and women who just want to make sure they have health care for their children so they can respond if somebody gets sick, if somebody has cancer, if somebody needs to have some health care help. They will see less health care and \$18 million more in tax increases if the Supreme Court sides

with the Republican position this month.

Pennsylvania, the Keystone State: 348,823 people. Again, a big State and a lot of people in Pennsylvania—348,823 people. This State will see almost \$30 million in total tax increases. So less health care, more taxes, if the Supreme Court gets this wrong and sides with the Republican position.

South Carolina: 154,221 people in South Carolina will see their taxes go up, meaning about \$43 million in total if this decision goes against the American people.

South Dakota, the Mount Rushmore State: This is another small State, but every single person there who is getting health care today and is paying less for it—most folks under \$100 a month—is going to care about this. There are 16,811 people in South Dakota who will get tax increases and less health care if the Supreme Court makes the wrong decision, if the Supreme Court in this case sides with the Republican position.

Tennessee: 155,753 people in Tennessee will see their taxes go up, with a total of about \$34 million just from Tennessee alone.

Texas: And here we begin to see bigger numbers. Again, big State, big numbers—832,334 people in Texas, and we are talking about over \$205 million in increased costs, increased taxes on people who live in Texas who just want to be able to provide health care for themselves and their children. That is all. This is not some big frill we are talking about here. It is pretty basic. We cannot control whether we get sick. We are looking at 832,000-plus people who are holding their breath waiting to see what the Supreme Court is going to do and whether they are going to side with them or they are going to side with the Republican position.

Utah: 86,330 individuals in Utah who will see their taxes go up, all together about \$18 million.

Virginia: 285,938 people. Pretty close by in Virginia. Again, on average, they will see a \$258 increase in their taxes or a total of \$74 million from Virginia. This is just across the bridge here.

West Virginia, the Mountain State: We have 26,145 West Virginians who would all, in total, see over \$8 million coming out of the State of West Virginia if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position on the tax credits under health care.

Wisconsin: 166,142 people. This is another close neighbor of ours in Michigan. There are 166,000-plus people who will see over \$52 million coming right across Lake Michigan, as we look across at Wisconsin. So less health care and taxes go up if the Supreme Court gets this wrong and sides with the Republican position.

And finally, Wyoming: 16,937 individuals and over \$7 million coming from the State of Wyoming in total taxes if the Supreme Court gets this wrong.

Madam President, a central question for Justices to consider in *King v.*

Burwell is legislative intent. That is a question I am, frankly, very qualified to answer, given how engaged I was in crafting the Affordable Care Act and especially the tax cuts represented in the affordable tax credits. I was there. I can speak firsthand to what the intent was.

The core purpose of this law was to make sure health care coverage was affordable for every American. Pretty simple. And to achieve that, I fought very hard to make sure these tax credits would be available; that they would be enough to make the difference.

I pushed so hard for these tax cuts in the Finance Committee markup that Chairman Baucus ended up calling me “Senator Affordability” in the process. I knew we had to get that right for every American, including those in my State. The key to this Affordable Care Act is for individuals and small businesses to be able to pool their risk to help drive down the cost for everyone, and it is doing that.

So the law created the marketplaces where Americans could shop. We also wanted to give States the right to create a marketplace of their own, if that was their preference. Now, here is the important part. We didn't want States to feel like they were being forced to create a marketplace, so we gave them a choice: either a Federal marketplace or you could choose a State marketplace.

The Federal marketplace created healthcare.gov. With healthcare.gov, every American has an opportunity to go online to see if they qualify for these savings, driven by the tax credits created within the Affordable Care Act. The great news is that 6.4 million Americans are getting those tax cuts right now.

Now the Court is considering the ludicrous idea that Congress actually meant to make those tax credits available in States that created their own exchanges but only in those States; that somehow we were not trying to make sure everybody in the United States had access to affordable health care and lower taxes and to put that money toward providing health care—not every exchange, not every State, not every person buying health insurance, only Americans living in States with a State-created exchange. That is what they have to believe in order to take the position the Republicans are asking us to take.

I can't think of a single instance in the history of our country where Members of the U.S. Congress have voted to give tax cuts to people in one State and not to people in another State, particularly if it is their own State that is not getting the tax cut.

Senator Max Baucus from Montana was chair of the Finance Committee at that time. In Montana, there was no plan to set up a State health care exchange. It is totally absurd to suggest that Senator Baucus would help write—would lead the writing of a health care bill with tax cuts for the

people of other States and not his own State. Why would I, as a Senator from Michigan, push so hard for these tax credits in the Affordable Care Act that my own constituents wouldn't qualify for but people in other States would? That makes no sense whatsoever. The legislative intent here is crystal clear.

So we have this bizarre situation where colleagues across the aisle are asking the Court to strike down the tax cuts and raise taxes on millions of their own constituents.

My belief on this issue is the same as it was 5 years ago when I pushed the tax credits through the Finance Committee: The right to get those tax credits has nothing to do with where you live in the United States of America; it has to do with whether you need health care for yourself and your children. If you are an American, then you deserve the opportunity to receive these tax cuts that will make health care affordable for you and your family. Whether you get your plan through a State exchange or through the Federal Government, it doesn't matter. That was intent of the law when we wrote it; that is how the law has worked since the marketplace opened; and that is how it should continue into the future.

Finally, I want to make it absolutely clear that the bill authored by the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON, is not a repeal-and-replace plan; it is a Trojan horse that would completely destroy the health care law that is currently providing medical care for over 16 million Americans in our country. Experts tell us it would lead to a death spiral, where rates would go up so high that only sick people would be willing to pay the premiums, making insurance completely unaffordable for American families. It would let your State decide what health benefits are essential to your family, meaning a family in Iowa could have completely different protections from someone living a few miles away in Minnesota. It puts an expiration date on the tax credits that make health coverage affordable. Conveniently enough, though, it extends the tax cuts until after the 2016 election. And there is the real danger that when the guarantee of these tax cuts expires in September 2017, they will not be renewed. By putting that expiration date after the election, it is clear that this bill's first priority isn't finding a way to make health care affordable; its priority is delaying a massive tax increase until after the election. The priority is to win an election first and dismantle affordable health care coverage second.

My hope and, frankly, my prayer is that the Court recognizes what I know to be true: that the language of this law is consistent with the original intent, which is clear from the very first words of the law, title I, page 1. Here is what it says: "Quality, Affordable Health Care for All Americans"—not Americans in some States and not others, all Americans.

It is my deep hope that the Court ruling will allow us to lock in affordable

health care coverage for good. Then we can move on and spend our time more productively, focusing on how to make a good law even better for families, communities, businesses, and providers. I hope that will be the opportunity we will have.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Wyoming.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DOUGLAS J. KRAMER TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 145, and that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that following the disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas J. Kramer, of Kansas, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Douglas J. Kramer, of Kansas, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session. The Senator from Wyoming.

FEDERAL REGULATIONS

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise today to speak about the growing burden of Federal regulations and the need to rein in the creation of new rules and the expansion of existing rules. The regulatory burden in 2014 is reported to be nearly \$2 trillion, and the Federal Register last year came out to nearly 78,000 pages of new rules and regulations. This chart shows that 78,000 pages of regulations is all too common, especially for this administration,

where regulatory overreach has become normal, and the size of the Federal Register has topped 80,000 pages for 4 out of the 6 years of the President's time in office. With this administration, we are seeing a high-water mark of regulations that are drowning American families and businesses.

The flood of regulations has been getting bigger every year for the past 2½ decades under administrations from both parties. We can't afford to keep piling on these rules. The economic burden of Federal regulations is clear. One study estimated that the regulatory burden in the United States cost more than \$1.8 trillion in 2014 and was bigger than the GDP of India.

My second chart puts this in perspective: Only the 10 largest economies are bigger than the U.S. regulatory burden all by itself.

This burden is real. Some studies have estimated the regulatory drag on economic growth in the United States to be as high as 2 percent per year over the last 6½ decades. An annual report from the Competitive Enterprise Institute also noted that in 2014 regulations cost the average household nearly \$15,000. A study by the Small Business Administration found that regulations increase costs by more than \$10,000 per employee.

The fact that we cannot afford this burden is just as clear. Economic growth in the first quarter shrank by seven-tenths of 1 percent. If we get a growth of 1 percent, it increases the revenue, without raising taxes, to the United States by \$300 billion. That is according to the Congressional Budget Office. According to the President's budget person, it would increase it by \$400 billion. Imagine what a seventh-tenths loss costs us.

Complex regulations are costly and time-consuming, especially for small businesses. Small business owners and their employees have to take on dozens of different responsibilities to make their business work. They have to be compliance experts now, and that takes time and resources away that they need to put toward growing their business and succeeding. I have spoken to many businesses in Wyoming that have stopped measuring their permitting applications in pages because it is easier to measure them in feet.

Businesses are struggling in this regulatory environment because they can't make long-term plans for investments. They don't know what new regulation might come out next month that will change their entire business model. And the problem with complex permitting and regulatory requirements is not just the cost that existing businesses have to bear; it also comes as a cost in businesses that don't even get started because the Federal Government has placed a mountain of paperwork between their idea and success.

The rush of regulations by this administration is clear. President Obama's administration has issued

more than 80 regulations that have a price tag of more than \$100 million each. That is, at a minimum, \$80 billion in costs for this administration's rules.

But what is more disturbing is not just the willingness to churn out more redtape but to find new and creative ways to do it. Agencies are only supposed to create new rules when they have clear authority from Congress to do so and can demonstrate a real need for the regulations. However, we are seeing more and more examples of the administration finding new justifications and new interpretations of laws that Congress has passed in order to get around Congress.

President Obama said that because he is unable to rely on Congress to achieve his agenda, he intends to use Executive orders. We have seen that with the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Labor Relations Board, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is collecting everybody's data as we speak, the National Security Agency, and so many other Federal agencies that are willing to read new authorities into existing laws and grant themselves new powers that Congress never intended.

One place that is willing to force through an agenda regardless of congressional intent, the will of the people, or the Constitution, is in the energy sector. Energy is one of the main drivers of our economy. Yet, this administration is doing everything it can to wage a regulatory war on coal by releasing rules and regulations designed to make coal harder to produce and making energy more expensive to use in our Nation. Anyone who uses electricity should be concerned about this—oh yeah, that is everybody, isn't it?

I recently talked to some sisters who were driving from Arizona to Wyoming. They were running low on gas, so they stopped in Colorado to fill up. The power was out at the gas station, so they couldn't pump gas or get a snack or use the restroom. All of these things—the gas pump, the cash register, the restroom lights—depend on electricity. Think of all the things around you that depend on electricity. Almost everything we do depends on electricity. Yet, this administration seems to want to do anything it can to drive up the cost of electricity.

A few years ago, Senators on both sides of the aisle realized that coal is one of our best sources of energy, the only stockpileable one, and rejected a cap-and-tax as an extremely expensive and bad idea—bipartisan. Now the administration is moving forward on a backdoor cap-and-tax proposal. They believe the best way to reach their goals of promoting alternative energy sources is to make the current sources more and more expensive to produce and to use. This hurts consumers, it hurts jobs, and it hurts our economy.

It is a simple fact: Make it more expensive to mine coal, and the coal in-

dustry will be less profitable. Make it more expensive to use coal to produce energy, and consumers will see a hit on their energy bills each and every month. Make it more difficult to turn a profit with coal, and coal workers will find themselves with fewer benefits, less job security, and a lot less employment, which costs the government more for unemployment.

This administration has made it clear that they do not care about these costs. The Small Business Advocate wrote EPA that their review panel on the Clean Power Plan was only checking the box and "is unlikely to succeed at identifying reasonable regulatory alternatives for small businesses." The incomplete information they provided "greatly limits [small entity representatives'] ability to propose potential regulatory flexibilities or discuss the costs and benefits of particular regulatory alternatives."

Rural electric cooperatives, transmission companies, and municipal utilities are going to bear the costs of these coal regulations. This is where our communities get their electricity, so those costs will likely be passed on to consumers. Businesses really have no other choice.

Several Members are pushing back on this regulatory overreach. For example, I am proud to cosponsor a bill Senator VITTER introduced earlier this week to protect small business from the onslaught of regulations. But the recent case of the Colowyo mine is a good example of how the administration does not care about a loss of jobs or costs to consumers and is a clear signal to Congress that we have to do more to oppose this.

Coal produced by this mine is responsible for employing over 200 people. The Craig Power Station in Senator GARDNER's State of Colorado sends power to a tristate cooperative which provides service in the West. If the cooperative goes offline, electricity prices for electric customers will rise. Why would it go offline? Because of a little vacation on the mine planned from 2007.

Senator GARDNER, will this affect your State's mine? But it also sets a wider precedent against our most dependable fuel source.

So what does taking this one mine offline—I know they are picking on a small one. That is easier to do than pick on a big one. But what does it mean to your constituents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming through the Chair for bringing that point to our colleagues about what is happening in western Colorado and the Colowyo mine.

The Senator from Wyoming mentioned in his comments that sometimes the regulations from this administration can and should be measured in a matter of feet and not just pages because that is how many new regulations are being piled upon businesses in this country.

In the case of the Colowyo Mine, though, a 2007 permit is being brought into question by a Federal court that has given this mine 120 days—the Office of Surface Mining—to rectify a decision that was made back in 2007. This is a court case that was brought 8 years after the 2007 permit was granted.

If the 120 days go by and the court decides that the review was not complete by the Office of Surface Mining, it could result in a shutdown of the Colowyo Mine. As you mentioned, this will result in 220 layoffs. Communities in western Colorado of Craig and Meeker will be devastated.

This mine is responsible for about \$200 million in economic impact to Western Colorado. It pays almost \$10 million to the Federal Government in terms of taxes. It pays about \$1 million to the State of Colorado in terms of severance taxes. Think about the impact that losing 220 people would have on the Main Street of Craig, CO, and on the people of Meeker, CO. Think about the impacts this would have on families and the kids of the 220 employees who are being pulled out of school systems. Maybe \$100,000 or more of impact to schools that can barely afford the loss already. That is just to mention the direct impacts to those communities of this court decision, and, by the way, we only have about 85 or 86 days left to rectify this permit decision if the Department of the Interior decides they are not going to appeal this decision. You have about 80-some days to make this decision that could affect the lives of 220 people, that could affect \$200 million worth of economic activity.

You mentioned that this power is from an electric co-op. The Senator from Wyoming mentioned that this power is from an electricity co-op, a cooperative. There are no shareholders. There are no stockholders. There is no guaranteed income to Tri-State.

This is an organization that is a cooperative. It is designed to be owned by its members, those people who receive power through the cooperative. When we increase the cost of electricity by closing down a mine that feeds the Craig Power Station, in this case, you are increasing the cost of that electricity. You are taking money out of the hands of members across the Tri-State region, whether that is in Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico or Nebraska. Those costs will get borne by the members of the cooperative.

One thing that we know as well is that Tri-State is one of those cooperatives that provide electricity to some of the poorest areas in Colorado. They are some of the areas that can least afford it. As a result of this decision, it will increase the cost of electricity, and those costs will be borne by those people who can least afford it—people on low income, people on fixed income, people in rural areas of our State who do not have as high an income as other areas in the State or country may have. This will have a significant economic impact.

In fact, the Senator from Wyoming may or may not know that a number of Members of Congress from the Colorado congressional delegation have written letters to the Department of the Interior urging them to appeal this decision as well as to put a stay on this decision, as we have 80-some days left and because 220 people, their lives, their livelihoods, their jobs are at stake, and these are small communities. They are communities that can be economically devastated with 220 job losses.

The Presiding Officer represents a State where there are many towns where five jobs are a really big deal, two jobs are a really big deal, one job is a really big deal. For a community that is the size of the town that I live in—3,000 people or so—to lose 220 jobs would be economic catastrophe.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Governor John Hickenlooper to the Honorable Sally Jewell, Secretary of the Interior, asking for an appeal of this decision. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Congressman ED PERLMUTTER to appeal this decision. In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter that I wrote, as well as Congressman SCOTT TIPTON wrote, asking and urging for an appeal of this decision.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF COLORADO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Denver, CO, May 22, 2015.

Hon. SALLY JEWELL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY JEWELL: On May 8, 2015, a federal District Court judge in Denver issued a decision that could have significant impacts to communities in Moffat and Rio Blanco Counties, in northwest Colorado. That ruling found that the Interior Department's Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) failed to perform adequate public notice and environmental analysis when approving a mining plan for the Colowyo Coal Mine pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. Colowyo employs 220 people, contributes over \$200 million to the regional economy, generates royalties and taxes estimated at \$12.0 million annually, and provides affordable and reliable electricity to Colorado and the Inter-mountain West.

The final judgment in the Colowyo case stated that the court will void OSMRE's approval of the mining plan if the agency does not, within 120 days, supplement the environmental analysis, provide public notice and an opportunity to comment, and render a new decision. Such a result would effectively shut down the Colowyo Coal Mine, result in layoffs for all 220 individuals, impact hundreds of other families and businesses in the region, and eliminate the principle source of coal for the Craig Station Power Plant.

We have expressed our concerns to OSMRE about these impacts and pledged to play whatever role we can to minimize them, including participation as a cooperating agency in OSMRE's supplemental environmental

review. Given the importance of this mine to the economies of the region, we ask that you do everything possible to respond to the judge's order and remedy the situation as expeditiously as possible. If needed, we encourage OSMRE to petition the court for an extension of the time granted to complete the supplemental environmental review. In addition, we encourage you and OSMRE to appeal the decision if appropriate, given potential adverse impacts on mines in Colorado and other federal permitting decisions.

Thank you for your consideration. If we can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. HICKENLOOPER,
Governor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 2, 2015.

Hon. SALLY JEWELL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY JEWELL: I write regarding the recent federal District Court ruling affecting the Colowyo mine in Colorado. The ruling found the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) failed to fulfill the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act when approving the amended mining plan in 2007. The ruling gave OSMRE 120 days to re-examine the application and comply with the deficiencies identified by the Court.

I am concerned this ruling could have a damaging impact on communities in Moffat and Rio Blanco Counties. The mine supports more than 200 employees, over \$200 million in annual economic impact to the region, and is important to the steady supply of coal for Craig Station Power Plant which provides electricity to thousands of Coloradans. Quick resolution to this case is important so these workers and communities have the certainty they need.

I understand OSMRE is working with the State of Colorado pursuant to the Court's 120-day timeline to conduct additional public outreach and considerations in the environmental assessment. The Colowyo Coal Company also filed an appeal of the decision last week. While OSMRE must continue working to follow the Court's orders, I believe the Interior Department should also direct the Justice Department to appeal the Court's decision.

Thank you for your consideration and your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

ED PERLMUTTER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2015.

Hon. SALLY JEWELL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

SECRETARY JEWELL: On May 8, 2015, the Federal District Court for the District of Colorado issued an order determining that the Office of Surface Mining ("OSM") failed to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") in 2007, when it issued a mine plan approval for the Colowyo Coal Mine. The Court gave OSM 120 days to prepare a new analysis and issue a new decision. If OSM does not complete the process in 120 days, the Court stated that it would vacate the mine plan, effectively shutting down the Mine.

We write to urge you to take all necessary and appropriate action to ensure the continued operation of the Colowyo Coal Mine, which is a critical component of northwest Colorado's regional economy and has responsibly operated in the eight years since the

mine plan approval was issued by your office. Coal produced by this mine, located in Moffat and Rio Blanco counties, is then used to generate power at the Craig station and is responsible for employing over 200 people with a payroll of around \$20 million dollars. Requested actions include urgently deploying sufficient personnel with the resources and expertise to complete the supplemental NEPA work within the 120 day window provided by the District Court.

Colowyo Coal Mine is a significant contributor to both of the counties' economies. The adverse effects of shutting down this mine go beyond the jobs at the mine that would be lost. We surely do not need to impress upon your office the potentially devastating impact of reducing operations at two of the counties' largest employers as well as one of the largest electricity providers in the western half of the state.

In addition, we strongly urge OSM to evaluate the propriety of an appeal. Without remarking on the reasoning of the Court contained within the decision itself, the result nonetheless creates adverse precedent with other suits pending, which would harm not only Colowyo and the town of Craig, but potentially numerous other mining operations and towns in other states as well. The federal government must vigorously defend the legality of its permitting actions, and leave policy debates over the role of coal to the legislative and rulemaking proceedings where those debates belong.

Respectfully,

CORY GARDNER,
U.S. Senator.
SCOTT TIPTON,
Member of Congress.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for his insights. This is the beginning of a process of eliminating coal mining in the United States. Here is a company that has their permit for 8 years for mining coal, and that permit took extensive permitting. Now what they are saying is that you have to take a look at where the coal is burned to see what the impacts are. That has never been one of the requirements. Again, it is one of those increases in regulation that this administration is fond of. It is designed to put things out of business, to raise costs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article called "The Case For Legislative Impact Accounting Economics 21," which is part of the Manhattan Institute.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[June 9, 2015]

THE CASE FOR LEGISLATIVE IMPACT ACCOUNTING ECONOMICS 21 (PART OF THE MANHATTAN INSTITUTE)

(By Jason J. Fichtner, Patrick A. McLaughlin)

For the first time in six years, Congress finally passed a budget resolution. The federal budget process, when it works, permits Congress to monitor and fund programs based on their fiscal impact. Yet every Congressional budget masks the true economic costs of federal spending. Mandatory spending, which makes up the vast majority of federal spending and includes interest on the national debt, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, is not part of the annual budget process. Also excluded from the annual budget

process are the costs of regulations. In fact, the vast majority of economic costs incurred by federal actions remain off the books.

We propose reforming the legislative and regulatory processes to put these costs on the books. After all, proper budgeting is about making trade-offs between competing wants and limited resources, and it requires planning, setting priorities and making difficult decisions. But these decisions cannot be made without a more complete understanding of the direct and indirect costs of proposed legislation and spending bills, and their regulatory progeny. Our proposal, called legislative impact accounting, would provide that information to Congress.

Estimates of the total cost of regulations vary widely, but by any account, they represent a significant cost to the economy. Government economists in the Office of Management and Budget tally up the direct compliance costs associated with rules created in the last decade that have an effect of more than \$100 million annually. OMB's most recent estimate was that annual costs fall between \$57 and \$84 billion. Conversely, economists John Dawson and John Seater estimated how the economy would look if federal regulations were held to 1949 levels—essentially asking the question: What if, instead of spending resources on regulatory compliance, businesses invested in research and development? The answer was shocking. In 2011, instead of \$15.1 trillion, annual GDP would have equaled \$54 trillion . . .

Our proposal, legislative impact accounting, would incorporate economic analyses of legislation and regulation into the budget process in two ways: First, when new legislation is proposed, an independent office—perhaps the Congressional Budget Office—would produce an estimate of the economic costs the legislation would create. Importantly, a legislative impact assessment would attempt to consider economic costs of proposed legislation, not just budgetary outlays. Examples of some of the effects that could be included as specific line items are: direct compliance costs, employment effects, technological hindrances, trade distortions, and changes to the cumulative regulatory burden. This type of analysis is not unprecedented. The European Commission provides impact assessments on all legislation considered by the European Parliament.

Second, legislative impact accounting would require retrospective analyses of the economic effects of legislation, starting five years after the legislation passed. The idea is to learn what the real effects have been, and to then update the original estimates produced in the first stage. This would effectively create a much-needed feedback loop that communicates information about the economic effects of legislation back to Congress.

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1735, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for mili-

tary construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McCain amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute.

McCain amendment No. 1456 (to amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels.

Cornyn amendment No. 1486 (to amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security.

Vitter amendment No. 1473 (to amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units.

Markey amendment No. 1645 (to amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil.

Reed (for Blumenthal) amendment No. 1564 (to amendment No. 1463), to increase civil penalties for violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

McCain (for Paul) modified amendment No. 1543 (to amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government.

Reed (for Durbin) modified amendment No. 1559 (to amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations.

McCain (for Burr) modified amendment No. 1569 (to amendment No. 1463), to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats.

Feinstein (for McCain) amendment No. 1889 (to amendment No. 1463), to reaffirm the prohibition on torture.

Fischer/Booker amendment No. 1825 (to amendment No. 1463), to authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, as we return to the legislation, unfortunately we are still, apparently, unable to move forward with managers' packages and amendments and others. So I would like to apologize to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have pending amendments, who have parts of managers' packages, and who have invested so many hours of time and effort to this legislation, not to mention members of the committee who spent an inordinate amount of time putting together a Defense authorization bill that I think all of us on both sides, with the exception of four who voted against it, were proud of and a product that was accomplished in a bipartisan fashion.

I, again, want to thank my friend from Rhode Island for all of his hard work. But apparently right now we are still stuck in resistance. Rather than go through all of the reasons why, I hope we can have some serious negotia-

tions in order for us to move forward and complete this legislation.

Meanwhile, the world moves on, and there are greater and greater challenges to our security. In fact, this morning the New York Times says: "Trainers Intended as Lift, but Quick Iraq Turnaround Is Unlikely." That is The New York Times.

The New York Times says:

Mr. Obama's plan does not call for small teams of American troops to accompany Iraqi fighters onto the battlefield, to call in airstrikes or advise on combat operations. Nor is it likely to significantly intensify an air campaign in which American warplanes have been able to locate and bomb their targets only about a quarter of the time.

"This alone is not going to do it," said Michele A. Flournoy, who was the senior policy official in the Pentagon during Mr. Obama's first term. "It is a great first step, but it should be the first in a series of steps."

One of the reasons I have that quote from Michele Flournoy is that it is not just former Bush administration officials. It is former Obama administration officials who all agree that what we are doing is without strategy and without prospect of success.

POLITICO article: "Obama's Iraq quagmire."

The President finds himself dragged back into a war he was elected to end.

When pressed on why the latest efforts do not include having American troops serve as spotters for airstrikes or sending Apache aircraft to back up the Iraqi troops, Deputy National Security Adviser Ben Rhodes told reporters the president "has been very clear he'll look at a range of different options."

That is encouraging that the President has been very clear. I love it. All these spokespeople use two sorts of fillers: One is "very clear" and the other is "quite frankly."

Do you ever notice that? Isn't that interesting? Maybe we should take that out of their vocabulary—"very clear" and "frankly"—when they are neither clear nor frank.

But anyway, Mr. Rhodes said—he is really a very interesting guy: "The U.S. military cannot and should not do this simply for Iraqis, and, frankly, Iraqis want to be in the lead themselves."

"The U.S. military cannot and should not do this simply for Iraqis."

Does anyone in the world think that the United States of America would be engaged simply for Iraqis? Has Mr. Rhodes ever listened to Mr. Baghdadi and ISIS and their intentions to attack and destroy America as much as they possibly can?

POLITICO: "Trainers or advisors? White House and Pentagon don't agree."

The White House says the new batch of troops deploying to Iraq are going to train Iraqi recruits to fight the Islamic State. The Pentagon says the 450 American personnel headed to Al-Taqaddum Air Base are going over just as advisors.

The mixed signals come as President Barack Obama struggles to find a balance between achieving his goal of "degrading and ultimately destroying" the terrorist group known as the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant while avoiding restarting a war in

Iraq that he has worked to end since he became President in 2009.

From The Wall Street Journal editorial this morning: “Obama’s Latest Iraq Escalation.”

President Obama all but admitted on Wednesday that his strategy against the Islamic State is flailing by ordering an additional 450 U.S. military advisers to join the 3,500 already in Iraq. Alas, this looks like more of the half-hearted incrementalism that hasn’t worked so far.

The fundamental problem with Mr. Obama’s strategy is that he is so determined to show that the U.S. isn’t returning to war in Iraq that he isn’t doing enough to win the war we are fighting. In September he pledged to “degrade” and ultimately “destroy” ISIS—the kind of commitment a U.S. President must never make lightly. But his fitful bombing and timid special-forces campaign hasn’t been able to stop the jihadist advances, much less drive it out of Iraq’s west-ern cities.

The longer ISIS stands up to a U.S. President pledging its destruction, the more of a magnet it becomes for young men willing to die for its perverted form of Islam.

Again, an article in the Wall Street Journal today: “To U.S. Allies, Al Qaeda Affiliate in Syria Becomes the Lesser Evil.”

This is what so many of us were so concerned about when we literally begged for help for the Free Syrian Army back as long ago as 3 years ago—that we would end up in a situation where we had the Faustian choice of Al Qaeda, Bashar al-Assad versus Al Qaeda or Al Qaeda-affiliated organizations. That is a scenario that most of us said might happen, unless we supported the Free Syrian Army.

The Wall Street Journal says:

In the three-way war ravaging Syria, should the local Al Qaeda branch be seen as the lesser evil to be wooed rather than bombed?

This is increasingly the view of some of America’s regional allies and even some Western officials.

Outnumbered and outgunned, the more secular, Western-backed rebels have found themselves fighting shoulder to shoulder with Nusra in key battlefields.

The list goes on and on.

Lebanon’s Labor Minister, who is a prominent Lebanese Christian politician long opposed to Mr. Assad, said:

“This is great error—we refuse the choice between ISIS and Nusra. We want to choose between democracy and dictatorship, not between terrorism and terrorism. If the Syrians have to choose between ISIS, Nusra or Assad, they will choose Assad.”

That is exactly the situation that Assad has been hoping for.

The New York Times: “Russian Groups Crowdfund the War in Ukraine.”

The Novorossiia Humanitarian Battalion boasts on its website that it provided funds to buy a pair of binoculars used by rebels in eastern Ukraine to spot and destroy an armored vehicle. . . . It is unclear just how extensive the fundraising network is, or how much money flows through it, though the separatist groups identified by The Times claim in social media posts to have raised millions of dollars.

The New York Times, “Increasingly Frequent Call on Baltic Sea: ‘The Russian Navy Is Back.’”

The Wall Street Journal, “The New Cold War’s Arctic Front: Putin is militarizing one of the world’s coldest, most remote regions.”

The Washington Post:

The U.S. should send aid to democracy’s front lines in Ukraine.

In the past several months, Ukraine’s freely elected government has taken dramatic steps to reform its economy, fight corruption and rebuild democratic institutions. It has imposed painful austerity on average Ukrainians, stripped oligarchs of political and economic privileges and rewritten laws to encourage free enterprise and foreign investment. It has done all this even while fighting a low-grade war against Russia, which has deployed an estimated 10,000 troops to eastern Ukraine and, with its local proxies, attacks Ukrainian forces on a near-daily basis. . . . What’s missing is a decision by Mr. Obama to make the defense of Ukraine a priority. The president has ceded leadership on the issue to Germany and France and overridden those in his administration and Congress who support arms deliveries. . . . A stronger U.S. commitment to Ukraine will not guarantee its success. But Mr. Obama’s lukewarm support risks a catastrophic failure for the cause of Western democracy.

I cannot emphasize enough to my colleagues that this is a critical and fundamental issue as to whether we will provide defensive weapons to Ukraine, and I would remind my colleagues who don’t want to send American troops anywhere that they are not asking for American troops. They are not asking for a single boot on the ground. Why in the world we can’t provide them with defensive weapons is something I will never understand as long as I live.

The New York Times, “Hackers May Have Obtained Names of Chinese with Ties to U.S. Government.”

And, of course, we all know that in the last week some 4 million Americans, at least, have been hacked into and had some of their most sensitive information broken into, which is one of the arguments many of us had for consideration of the cyber bill on the floor of the Senate as part of the Defense bill. Obviously, we are in a cyber war. Obviously, it requires the involvement and engagement of the Department of Defense, along with our intelligence agencies, and that is why I am a bit taken aback by the vociferous opposition by my colleagues on that side of the aisle to addressing this issue since it is clearly part of the defense and security of this Nation.

I would like to mention—and I appreciate the indulgence of my friend from Rhode Island—the issue of Russian rocket engines. Less than 6 months after the prohibition was enacted in last year’s NDAA, which would end the use of RD-180 on military space launches by 2019, the administration has stated they want access to 14 more Russian rocket engines. Agreeing to the administration’s request endorses another 8 years of Russian rocket engines and over \$300 million for Vladimir Putin and his cronies.

We must not reward Vladimir Putin and the Russian military industrial

complex. We cannot in good conscience agree to reward the Russian military industrial base with over \$300 million in rocket engines while they occupy Crimea, destabilize Ukraine, send weapons to Iran, and violate the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty.

The bill before us today would limit the use of Russian rocket engines and restates the committee’s direction to end the use of Russian engines for national security space launches by 2019. There are some who want to continue our Nation’s dependence on Russian rocket engines. The NDAA would put an end to this dependence and stop hundreds of millions of dollars from going to Vladimir Putin. We can meet our national security space needs without Russia, and we must lead by example by eliminating our dependence as quickly as possible and fostering competition.

I say to my colleagues, we have two launch providers, ULA and SpaceX. Regardless of the Russian RD-180, we will be able to provide full redundant capabilities by 2017 with the Delta IV, Falcon 9, and Falcon Heavy. There will be no capability gap. The Atlas 5 is not going anywhere anytime soon. With the engines allowed under this amendment, ULA has enough Atlas 5s to get them through at least 2018, if not later.

As the New York Times editorial board stated last week:

When sanctions are necessary, the countries that impose them must be willing to pay a cost, too. After leaning on France to cancel the sale of two ships to Russia because of the invasion of Ukraine, the United States can hardly insist on continuing to buy national security hardware from one of Mr. Putin’s cronies.

I have a Reuter’s article from last year. “Comrade Capitalism: In murky Pentagon deal with Russia, big profit for a tiny Florida firm.”

ULA’s dealings with Russia are troubling and ethically questionable. A Reuters investigation this past November on the RD-180 raises troubling issues regarding the businesses and shell companies that facilitate the purchase of Russian rocket engines. The report describes a five-person company called RD AMROSS, a joint venture between Russian rocket engine manufacturer Energomash and Pratt and Whitney Rocketdyne that collects nearly \$93 million in cost markups.

The article uncovers that in the past, RD AMROSS was investigated by the Defense Contract Management Agency, which determined that in a previous contract, RD AMROSS had collected \$80 million in “unallowable excessive pass-through charges.”

The article titled “Comrade Capitalism” also exposed the role senior Russian politicians and close friends of Vladimir Putin play in the in the Energomash management. The article states that according to a Russian audit of Energomash, the Russian rocket manufacturer had been operating at a loss because funds were

“being captured by unnamed offshore intermediary companies.”

Well, I just want to say there is no argument for the continued purchase of these rocket engines from the Russians—from Vladimir Putin and his cronies, one of whom was involved in the management and has been sanctioned by the United States of America.

I have confidence America is capable of building our own rocket engines, and I am confident we can do that in a reasonable period of time—like 1 to 2 years. For us to commit to the continued use of these rocket engines and making millions and millions of dollars, in this case \$300 million, for Vladimir Putin and his cronies is—the question has to be asked of individuals who want to continue the purchase of these rocket engines from this Russian shell company: Why do you want to help Vladimir Putin? Why do you want to help Vladimir Putin and his cronies by giving them as much as \$300 million? That is a legitimate question.

If any of my colleagues who support this basically unlimited or continued purchase of rocket engines from Russia rather than having it terminated in a reasonable and very short time, the question has to be asked: Why are you helping Vladimir Putin? Why are you helping his cronies? That is a legitimate question, and if any of my colleagues try to force this continued and unnecessary purchase of Russian rocket engines, that question needs to be asked of them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473, AS MODIFIED

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment No. 1473 be modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 38, line 12, insert after “**FIGHTER AIRCRAFT**” the following: “**AND ARMY COMBAT UNITS**”.

On page 43, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(e) **MINIMUM NUMBER OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.**—Section 3062 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e)(1) Effective October 1, 2015, the Secretary of the Army shall maintain the following:

“(A) A total number of brigade combat teams for the regular and reserve components of the Army of not fewer than 32 brigade combat teams.

“(B) A total number of brigade combat teams for the Army National Guard of not fewer than 26 brigade combat teams.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘brigade combat team’ means any unit that consists of—

“(A) an arms branch maneuver brigade;

“(B) its assigned support units; and

“(C) its assigned fire teams”.

(f) **REDUCTION OF ARMY BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS.**—

(1) **PRESERVATION OF TEAMS.**—The Secretary of the Army shall give priority to maintaining 32 brigade combat teams for the Army as required by subsection (e)(1) of section 3062 of title 10 United States Code (as amended by subsection (e) of this section), and shall carry out such priority as funding or appropriations become available to maintain such war fighting capability.

(2) **REDUCTION.**—Notwithstanding subsection (e)(1) of section 3062 of title 10 United States Code (as so amended), or paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary may, after October 1, 2015, reduce the number of brigade combat teams for the Army to fewer than 32 brigade combat teams upon the latest of the following:

(A) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary submits the report required by paragraph (3).

(B) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the reduction of Army brigade combat teams will not increase the operational risk of meeting the National Defense Strategy.

(C) The date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that funding or appropriations are not adequate to sustain 32 brigade combat teams for the regular Army.

(3) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(A) The rationale for any proposed reduction of the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as so amended), and an operational analysis of the total strength of the Army that demonstrates performance of the designated mission at an equal or greater level of effectiveness as the personnel of the Army so reduced.

(B) An assessment of the implications for the Army, the Army National Guard of the United States, and the Army Reserve of the force mix ratio of Army troop strengths and combat units after such reduction.

(C) Such other matters relating to the reduction of the total strength of the Army as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(g) **ADDITIONAL REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—At least 90 days before the date on which the total strength of the Army, including the National Guard and Reserves, is reduced below the strength provided in subsection (e) of section 3062 of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (e) of this section), the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with (where applicable) the Director of the Army National Guard or Chief of the Army Reserve, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the reduction.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A list of each major combat unit of the Army that will remain after the reduction, organized by division and enumerated down to the brigade combat team-level or its equivalent, including for each such brigade combat team—

(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

(B) A list of each brigade combat team proposed for disestablishment, including for each such unit—

(i) the mission it is assigned to; and

(ii) the assigned unit and military installation where it is based.

(C) A list of each unit affected by a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B) and a description of how such unit is affected.

(D) For each military installation and unit listed under subparagraph (B)(ii), a description of changes, if any, to the designed operational capability (DOC) statement of the unit as a result of a proposed disestablishment.

(E) A description of any anticipated changes in manpower authorizations as a result of a proposed disestablishment listed under subparagraph (B).

(h) **REPORT MANNING OF BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS AT ACHIEVEMENT OF ARMY ACTIVE END-STRENGTH.**—Upon the achievement of the end strength for active duty personnel of the Army specified in section 401(1), the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the current manning of each brigade combat team of the Army.

(i) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section should be construed to supersede Army manning of brigade combat teams at designated levels.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I discussed this amendment yesterday on the floor. It deals with brigade combat teams in the Army, making sure we don't cut through fat and into meat and bone with regard to that essential part of our force. I urge bipartisan support of this commonsense amendment.

There is already language in the underlying bill that takes similar action on the Air Force side and on the Navy side with regard to major, significant key units in those forces, and it is the same principle that would be applied to the Army's brigade combat teams.

This amendment is strongly supported by the national organizations built around both the Army National Guard and the Regular Army.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1564

Mr. REED. Madam President, I call for regular order with respect to amendment No. 1564.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 1564, AS MODIFIED

Mr. REED. I have a modification to that amendment, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. INTEREST RATE LIMITATION ON DEBT ENTERED INTO DURING MILITARY SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE MILITARY SERVICE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (a) of section 207 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 527) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “ON DEBT INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE” after “LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

“(2) LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT ON DEBT INCURRED DURING SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE.—An obligation or liability bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year that is incurred by a servicemember, or the servicemember and the servicemember’s spouse jointly, during military service to consolidate or refinance one or more student loans incurred by the servicemember before such military service shall not bear an interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent during the period of military service.”;

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by inserting “or (2)” after “paragraph (1)”; and

(5) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “the interest rate limitation in subsection (a)” and inserting “an interest rate limitation in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “AS OF DATE OF ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “in the case of an obligation or liability covered by subsection (a)(1), or as of the date the servicemember (or servicemember and spouse jointly) incurs the obligation or liability concerned under subsection (a)(2)”.

(c) STUDENT LOAN DEFINED.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) STUDENT LOAN.—The term ‘student loan’ means the following:

“(A) A Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

“(B) A private student loan as that term is defined in section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)).”.

SEC. 1086. TERMINATION OF RESIDENTIAL LEASES AFTER ASSIGNMENT OR RELOCATION TO QUARTERS OF UNITED STATES OR HOUSING FACILITY UNDER JURISDICTION OF UNIFORMED SERVICE.

(a) TERMINATION OF RESIDENTIAL LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 305 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 535) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) in the case of a lease described in subsection (b)(1) and subparagraph (C) of such subsection, the date the lessee is assigned to or otherwise relocates to quarters or a housing facility as described in such subparagraph.”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) the lease is executed by or on behalf of a person who thereafter and during the term of the lease is assigned to or otherwise relocates to quarters of the United States or a housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code), including housing provided under the Military Housing Privatization Initiative.”.

(2) MANNER OF TERMINATION.—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting “in the case of a lease described in subsection (b)(1) and subparagraph (A) or (B) of such subsection,” before “by delivery”; and

(ii) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph (B):

“(B) in the case of a lease described in subsection (b)(1) and subparagraph (C) of such subsection, by delivery by the lessee of written notice of such termination, and a letter from the servicemember’s commanding officer indicating that the servicemember has been assigned to or is otherwise relocating to quarters of the United States or a housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code), to the lessor (or the lessor’s grantee), or to the lessor’s agent (or the agent’s grantee); and”.

(b) DEFINITION OF MILITARY ORDERS AND CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES FOR PURPOSES OF ACT.—

(1) TRANSFER OF DEFINITIONS.—Such Act is further amended by transferring paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 305(i) (50 U.S.C. App. 535(i)) to the end of section 101 (50 U.S.C. App. 511) and redesignating such paragraphs, as so transferred, as paragraphs (10) and (11).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such Act is further amended—

(A) in section 305 (50 U.S.C. App. 535), as amended by paragraph (1), by striking subsection (i); and

(B) in section 705 (50 U.S.C. App. 595), by striking “or naval” both places it appears.

SEC. 1087. PROTECTION OF SURVIVING SPOUSE WITH RESPECT TO MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 531 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 (50 U.S.C. App. 533) the following new section:

“SEC. 303A. PROTECTION OF SURVIVING SPOUSE WITH RESPECT TO MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), with respect to a servicemember who dies while in military service and who has a surviving spouse who is the servicemember’s successor in interest to property covered under section 303(a), section 303 shall apply to the surviving spouse with respect to that property during the one-year period beginning on the date of such death in the same manner as if the servicemember had not died.

“(b) NOTICE REQUIRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be covered under this section with respect to property, a surviving spouse shall submit written notice that such surviving spouse is so covered to the mortgagee, trustee, or other creditor of the mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage with which the property is secured.

“(2) TIME.—Notice provided under paragraph (1) shall be provided with respect to a surviving spouse anytime during the one-year period beginning on the date of death of the servicemember with respect to whom the surviving spouse is to receive coverage under this section.

“(3) ADDRESS.—Notice provided under paragraph (1) with respect to property shall be provided via e-mail, facsimile, standard post, or express mail to facsimile numbers and addresses, as the case may be, designated by the servicer of the mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage with which the property is secured.

“(4) MANNER.—Notice provided under paragraph (1) shall be provided in writing by using a form designed under paragraph (5) or

submitting a copy of a Department of Defense or Department of Veterans Affairs document evidencing the military service-related death of a spouse while in military service.

“(5) OFFICIAL FORMS.—The Secretary of Defense shall design and distribute an official Department of Defense form that can be used by an individual to give notice under paragraph (1).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 303A of such Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to deaths that occur on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

“Sec. 303A. Protection of surviving spouse with respect to mortgage foreclosure.”.

SEC. 1088. MAKING PERMANENT EXTENDED PERIOD OF PROTECTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES RELATING TO MORTGAGES, MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE, AND EVICTION.

Section 710(d) of the Honoring America’s Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-154) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (3).

SEC. 1089. INCREASE IN CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SERVICEMEMBERS CIVIL RELIEF ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 801(b)(3) of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 597(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “\$55,000” and inserting “\$110,000”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “\$110,000” and inserting “\$220,000”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) that occur on or after such date.

Mr. REED. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIPARTISAN SOLUTIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, this morning I heard the distinguished majority leader say it was a time for bipartisan solutions. He said: “What America needs right now is a season of serious bipartisan solutions.”

Democrats couldn’t agree more. We have been asking for weeks for all parties to sit down and start talking about the budget—not at the eleventh hour, not when we are already at the edge of a cliff, but now.

From a substantive perspective, this only makes sense. Both parties hate the sequester. Both parties understand there is a smarter way to budget than senselessly acting as though we are hostage to these arbitrary, meat-cleaver cuts that were never intended to go into effect, whether on the defense side or on the nondefense side.

So, Mr. Majority Leader, let’s sit down and start talking about some serious bipartisan solutions.

The majority leader makes it seem as though he has been negotiating and being fair. Every number in the Appropriations Committee had no consultation from the Democrats. They just chose the numbers. That is not bipartisan. They did not talk to the White House, which has veto power over every one of these. That is not bipartisan.

We all know that the only way we are going to get something done on the budget, on the spending bills is by sitting down together and talking. Why not sooner rather than later? Why not now rather than at the last minute?

There is a charade going on by my friends on the other side. They totally decide the appropriations numbers by themselves. They totally decide to use OCO for defense but they do nothing for the nondefense side. Then they say: Let's move forward with those bills.

That is not bipartisan. Have any Democrats been consulted? I ask the majority leader: Who has he consulted on the other side of the aisle about his numbers? Who has he consulted at the White House about his numbers? He knows he needs input from both to get anything done.

I think what the majority leader wants to do is play a game of chicken—wait until the end and then say: Do it our way. Well, that is not going to work.

Over the next month or two, the American people are going to see that we will not move forward on these proposals until—but certainly with great vigor when—there is a bipartisan discussion and agreement. We all know how this place works. The Senate and our system of government—both the executive and the Congress—are involved in doing the budget and doing the appropriations bills in particular. It works only when both parties come to agreement. When one party tries to shove things down the other party's throat, which, in all due respect, is what the majority leader is now doing, we end up with worries and sometimes the reality of a government shutdown. If the majority leader wants that, he should continue with this strategy, and any shutdown will be on his hands. We don't want that, the American people don't want that, and my guess is most of the Members on this side of the aisle don't want that. We want to come to an agreement.

All we want the majority leader to do is talk to us, not to decide in his office or maybe with the chair of the Appropriations Committee what all the numbers should be—how much to spend on defense, how much to spend on education, how much to spend on highways. Those are some of the most important decisions we make around here, and they will not be made without bipartisanism, sooner rather than later.

Mr. Majority Leader, like it or not, we have a Democratic President, and we have 46 Democratic votes in the Senate—enough to stop us from mov-

ing forward if we can't negotiate—like it or not, Mr. Majority Leader.

The path the majority leader is pursuing is a cul-de-sac that will either force us to sit down and negotiate later in the day or force a CR, which no one wants, or even if some of the people on that side of the aisle have their way, a government shutdown, as they did once before. None of those is a good solution. The best solution is for us to all sit down and talk. We should not keep kicking the can down the road. Yet, here we are.

In Roll Call this week: "McConnell Cool to Budget Summit."

When he was asked: Is it time to start talking about the budget, he replied: No, of course not. Why? What is his logic? His logic is Democrats should just accept everything Republicans want.

That is not why we have two parties. That is not how the Senate works. That is not how democracy works. There is nothing left for Democrats to conclude other than that there is a yawning chasm between the Republican leader's stated intentions and his actions to date, because the current posture by the majority has been this: my way or shut down the government. Well, we have seen that before, it didn't work, and it is not going to work this time.

We are saying, let's negotiate and let's start those negotiations soon, before it is too late. If the Republican leader truly wants a season of bipartisan solutions, well, the winds are blowing in one direction. Sit down with Democrats and let's start negotiating a sensible budget, and let's start doing it now. We are ready to sit down this afternoon. We are ready to sit down at any moment that he gives us a signal. Let's get in the room and start the real work of finding bipartisan agreement on the budget, plain and simple.

One other thing, when the American people ask why Washington so gridlocked, just look at how the majority leader is handling one of the most important parts of what the government does, where the dollars go. There is gridlock when one side insists that it has to get all of its way and not sit down with the other side. That is the path at the moment that the majority leader is on. We hope he gets off of it. It is untenable. It won't work. It will lead to a bad solution.

Once again, I repeat: We are willing to sit down and start talking about the budget, talking about how much to spend on defense and transportation and education and medical research today. We are waiting, Mr. Majority Leader, for you to give us that ability, that signal, so we can actually enact a budget without acrimony and that will work for this great country of ours.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1569, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, earlier this year, the Senate Intelligence Committee reported the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act to the Senate

floor. This bill is intended to facilitate sharing of cyber threat information between the private sector and the government. While this could be useful in protecting against cyber attacks, I am concerned that certain provisions in the Senate Intelligence Committee's bill would severely undermine Americans' privacy.

Senator BARR's bill would remove all existing legal restrictions to allow an unprecedented wave of information—including Americans' personal communications—to flow from the private sector into government databases without any meaningful controls or limitations. It would explicitly authorize the government to use this information to "prevent" crimes that have nothing to do with cybersecurity, such as firearms possession, arson, and robbery.

These problems are compounded by the fact that this bill requires all information provided to the government through the information-sharing regime to be immediately disseminated, which does not allow time for removal of unnecessary private information, to a number of Federal agencies—including the National Security Agency and others. We do not know whether this information would also be shared with the Drug Enforcement Administration, or the Internal Revenue Service, for example. We do know this would open a new flow of information to the Federal Government, without appropriate restrictions on how these agencies can store, query, or mine this information.

Congress should enact cybersecurity legislation to protect American businesses and the American people. But we need a cyber security bill, not a cyber surveillance bill.

There are also provisions in this bill that add entirely new exemptions to the Freedom of Information Act, FOIA. These provisions are completely unnecessary, and have the potential to greatly weaken government transparency.

Senator BARR's information sharing bill is major legislation that deserves full debate and a meaningful opportunity for Senators to offer amendments to improve the bill. It has had neither.

The bill was drafted behind closed doors. It has not been the subject of any open hearings or public debate. The text of the bill was only made public by the Intelligence Committee after it was reported to the Senate floor, and no other committee of jurisdiction—including the Judiciary Committee—was allowed to consider and improve the bill. I shared with Chairman GRASSLEY my concern that the Judiciary Committee should also consider this bill, and Chairman GRASSLEY assured me that there would be a "robust and open amendment process" if this bill were considered on the Senate floor. I expect that the Senate Homeland Security Committee received the same assurances.

Senator BARR's attempt to offer the Intelligence Committee's information sharing bill as an amendment to the

National Defense Authorization Act runs directly counter to those assurances. This is not a sincere effort to consider and pass this bill under regular order. Instead, through a series of procedural maneuvers, Republican leadership is deliberately preventing any type of meaningful debate on this bill.

I agree that we must do more to protect our cyber security, but we should not rush to pass legislation that has significant privacy implications for millions of Americans. We must be thoughtful and responsible. Attempting to stifle meaningful debate and pass this bill as an amendment to the NDAA is the wrong answer. That is not how the Senate should operate. I urge Senators to vote no on cloture.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, Senator VITTER spoke about his amendment, No. 1473, to the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, which makes certain our U.S. Army is able to maintain the current number of brigade combat teams to prevent further reductions to the Army force structure.

I support Senator VITTER's amendment and encourage my colleagues to do the same so that our military men and women are prepared to face our Nation's evolving national security threats.

Our Army and soldiers here at home and abroad need all the support we can give them. In the coming months, I look forward to welcoming home Major General Funk, who is currently serving in Iraq and leading the front against ISIS. We must remember that he and the soldiers he commands need our help and protection, just as they serve and protect us.

The across-the-board cuts called for in the Budget Control Act, including a reduced force structure, make no sense when our country continues to face global threats. The cuts fail to establish priorities and suggest that every program has equal value, which is not the case.

In my home State of Kansas, these reductions could have a significant impact on the Intellectual Center of the Army, Fort Leavenworth, and the Army's First Infantry Division, the Big Red One.

The Big Red One is just one of the many divisions across the country that could lose entire brigade combat teams, BCTs, degrading our Army's ability to meet current and emerging challenges such as Russian aggression, Ebola response operations, and taking on terrorist organizations like ISIS or Al Shabaab. I mention these specific examples because they are the most recent situations over the last 12 months that call on our Armed Forces to be ready and resilient.

Without arbitrary budget reductions, the Army would not intentionally choose to downsize the Army and let valuable soldiers go.

As the cochair for the Senate Defense Communities Caucus, we must consider

our towns and citizens who overwhelmingly support our military. These reductions make no common sense for our communities and the soldiers and their families who call our towns home.

These reductions impact the morale of the men and women who serve our country, as well as their families, at a time when we need their commitment and readiness the most.

I urge my colleagues to support Senator VITTER's amendment. Maintaining our Nation's military forces must be our top priority. A capable and strong national defense is critical to the security of the United States and is our Federal Government's primary constitutional responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to join the bipartisan group of Armed Services Committee members who support a very important measure for our troops. Last month, we overwhelmingly voted in favor of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2016 that the Senate is considering today.

The defense of our Nation is a fundamental responsibility of the Federal Government, and the annual passage of the NDAA is an important step in making sure that our servicemembers have what they need to do their job and to succeed. These brave men and women selflessly sacrifice everything to keep us safe from the forces of darkness that wish to do us harm. We owe it to these men and women to wisely work together to make certain they have the necessary tools to accomplish their dangerous and demanding missions, and that is what we did in the Armed Services Committee just a few weeks ago.

Under the leadership of Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED, we reported a bill out of committee that not only supports our Armed Forces but makes a host of needed reforms as well, and we did this overwhelmingly by a bipartisan vote of 22 to 4.

I would like to cite a number of the bill provisions which make our Nation stronger and which I hope Congress and the President will enact into law.

Our bill cuts nearly \$10 billion in wasteful and duplicative spending, thereby freeing up additional funds to develop and procure weapons systems of the future, while also giving our troops in combat the tools they need today.

This bill also makes important reforms aimed at recruiting and retaining the All-Volunteer Force that has so consistently defended our country for over four decades.

The Armed Services Committee produced this legislation by using the limited and admittedly less than optimal funding tools at its disposal. For now, the hand we are dealt is limited by the Budget Control Act, which includes arbitrary spending caps and the threat of sequestration. So in our bill we are

funding our Armed Forces using funds from the overseas contingency operations account. We are doing so at a level above that requested by the President for this account. OCO was included in the Budget Control Act because Members of the 112th Congress recognized the importance of funding our men and women who serve on the frontlines.

I believe that many Members of the Senate fervently hope that in the near future we will be able to fund our government in a fiscally sound manner, without the irrational budget caps and threat of sequestration that pervades all of Congress's budgetary deliberations.

I am willing to work with any of my colleagues on either side of the aisle to fix the Budget Control Act, but until that day comes, we need to use the funding options we have available to keep America safe. The legislation before us today does exactly that. We are following the rules that are in force today.

I am proud of my colleagues who serve with me on the Armed Services Committee for coming together to achieve a truly bipartisan, comprehensive bill. Our bill will support our troops and meet the demands of a military that needs to continue its dynamic evolution in the face of ever more sophisticated threats. And I am pleased that a number of provisions I offered are included in the final package we are debating today.

Now that we have completed our work in committee and Leader McCONNELL has brought our bill to the full Senate for debate, we must come together to pass the NDAA, as the Senate has done each year for more than five decades. It is no coincidence that the NDAA is the only legislation to achieve this track record; rather, it indicates the vital importance that generations of Senate Members have attached to it. The defense of our country is not a partisan issue.

The bipartisan NDAA sustains what our servicemembers need to succeed in a world that grows ever more dangerous. From the Russian aggression in Ukraine and mounting Chinese coercion in Asia to the ugly aggression of the self-proclaimed Islamic State in the Middle East, new threats continue to rise throughout the world. These threats are multifaceted, and our enemy's tactics ever-changing. We must make certain our Armed Forces can continue to face these challenges, and we must uphold our commitment to them.

I encourage my colleagues to pass the NDAA, and I encourage our President to work with Congress to keep Americans safe.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

ZIVOTOFSKY V. KERRY DECISION

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, earlier this week, the Supreme Court

wrongly decided the case of *Zivotofsky v. Kerry*, an unprecedented decision which impairs Congress's role in foreign policy and which is an affront to our close ally Israel.

The *Zivotofsky* case concerned the executive branch's refusal to implement a 2002 law passed by Congress and signed by the President. The law required State Department officials to offer U.S. persons born in Jerusalem the option of listing Israel as their location of birth on passports and other consular documents. The State Department's practice had been to list the place of birth only as Jerusalem, reflecting the President's policy of not recognizing any national sovereign authority over the Holy City.

Despite the fact that a President signed the statute into law, the executive branch has fought tooth and nail for 13 years to free itself from what it viewed as the heavy burden of writing the word "Israel" on one line in a tiny number of U.S. passports, and it argued its case all the way to the Supreme Court.

In litigating the *Zivotofsky* case, it is no surprise that the President outlined a maximalist vision for his power to steer the Nation's foreign policy, leaving little room for the people's representatives in Congress. But it was a surprise that the Supreme Court acquiesced to the President's position.

Before Monday, in the entire 225-year history of our Nation, the Supreme Court had never sided with a President's blatant refusal to comply with a duly-passed statute affecting the conduct of foreign affairs. This is a remarkable and disturbing break with precedent and one made through a poorly reasoned judicial opinion. The Court announced that the President possesses an exclusive constitutional power to recognize other nations and that this power crowds out any attempt by Congress to legislate in this area, including on how locations of birth are characterized on passports.

But this conclusion suffers from a number of problems. The Court is supposed to only find a preclusive executive power where such a power is clearly committed to the executive branch in our Constitution. But nowhere in the text of the Constitution is there a reference to a recognition power, let alone an allocation of such a power to the President alone. The Court acknowledges this in its opinion, so it instead finds the recognition power embedded in the constitutional provision stating that the President "shall receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers." But, as Alexander Hamilton wrote in *Federalist 69*, that provision was understood to be a matter of "dignity," not "authority" that would have "no consequence for the administration of government." In other words, that provision does not imbue the President with a power; it imposes an obligation on him, and a ceremonial one at that.

The provision furthermore appears in the section of the Constitution that

imposes an array of obligations on the President, not the section investing him with any powers. Ironically, it appears right before the provision that obligates the President to "take care that the Laws be faithfully executed." I would assume the Framers believed that "the Laws" would include ones regarding passports.

I want to be very clear on this. The recognition power the Court identified is not enumerated in the text of the Constitution, and no one at the time of the founding believed it to be included. At the same time, the Constitution explicitly entrusts Congress with grave international responsibilities, including the power to declare war and raise and support armies. These powers place the legislative branch in a central role in the conduct of our Nation's foreign policy. The Supreme Court therefore stood on remarkably shaky ground when it announced a supposedly exclusive Presidential power—one that can nullify contrary congressional enactments. And it unwisely and indeterminately expanded the President's unchecked discretion in the conduct of foreign affairs. That is a potentially dangerous opening, particularly with the current President. President Obama has shown an unhealthy penchant for granting unilateral concessions to longtime enemies abroad. That tendency cannot and must not go unchecked.

Beyond the constitutional infirmities of the Court's opinion, I want to comment on the broader issue in the background of the *Zivotofsky* case.

The executive branch based its refusal to comply with the passport law on the fear that identifying a person born in Jerusalem as having been born in Israel would upend the peace process. The State Department declared that compliance with the law "would critically compromise" U.S. efforts to forge an agreement between Israel and the Palestinians, "significantly harm" our foreign policy, and "cause irreversible damage" to the role of the United States as an honest broker.

That is embarrassing hyperbole, and it is also complete nonsense. The role of an honest broker in negotiations is just that—to be honest. So let's be honest. Israel's seat of government is located in Jerusalem. Israel administers the entire city. Over 500,000 Israelis live and work in Jerusalem. The reality is that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel, and any final agreement—whether or not it includes some sort of sharing arrangement—will not change that. The United States and the world should not deny that reality; they should accept it and then begin the hard work of helping the parties forge a lasting peace.

The role of an honest broker is to ground negotiations in truth. It is to quell unreasonable reactions and expectations. It is to strip away issues that are peripheral and focus on those that are essential.

That the President believes the designation of Jerusalem as a part of

Israel on a passport can throw the entire prospect of peace into a tailspin says much about his confidence in his abilities as a mediator, and it perhaps also says much about the current political climate in the Middle East, where deepened divisions would render renewed talks at this point unproductive.

Ultimately, a resolution of the Israel-Palestinian dispute should be reached, but progress toward that resolution will not move forward if the Palestinians remain unreasonably sensitive to peripheral issues such as passports. It will not move forward if the President is afraid to speak the truth. It will not move forward if the United States Congress is restrained from adding a dose of reality to the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. 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. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, we have 2 more weeks remaining before the scheduled district work period with regard to the Fourth of July. Then, when we come back from there, in the next work period there will be another deadline. The deadline I am referring to is the enactment of a 6-year transportation reauthorization bill.

We have been talking about finding a 6-year reauthorization solution now for over a year—well over a year. We have been working with short-term extensions. We had a 10-month extension that expired just recently. We did another 2-month extension with a commitment that our committees would work to come together, that Democrats and Republicans would work to come together for a 6-year reauthorization of the transportation programs for this country.

My constituents are frustrated. I am frustrated. You see, I commute between Baltimore and Washington every day. This community or this area has the second worst traffic congestion in the country. We desperately need a more robust Federal partner in dealing with the transportation challenges of my State and of every State in this country. We need to move forward with transit projects. Every person we can get to use mass transit is one less car on the road.

It helps all of us. It helps our transportation infrastructure and the wear and tear. It helps our environment. We have bridges that literally must be replaced. In the southern part of my State, the Nice Bridge desperately

needs to be replaced. That costs money. You need a Federal partner to do that. We have road maintenance and expansion issues in every State in this country.

We have safety concerns that are not being addressed today. I would like to take my colleagues to some of the overpasses in Baltimore that need to be upgraded for the purposes of safety. Route 1 through College Park desperately needs attention. In my State, there is Georgia Avenue and Randolph Road in Montgomery County and 301, a major artery on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, which need real serious safety upgrades that are important.

Each one of these is extremely expensive. I know that every Senator could list dozens of projects in their own State that need to move forward for safety reasons. Then there is the issue of jobs. We all know that without the predictability of a 6-year program, transportation construction is delayed. That costs us not only construction jobs—and there are literally millions of construction jobs that depend upon the Federal partnership in transportation—but the economic impact of a reauthorization of the surface transportation program. So many projects in Maryland are affected by this.

But let me talk about one part of Maryland that does not always get the same attention, and that is the western part of our State. It is not where the real population of Maryland is located. But the completion of the Appalachia Highway, the north-south highway, is critically important to the economic future of western Maryland—and I might tell you also Pennsylvania and West Virginia. We need to get that done.

Quite frankly, without a long-term reauthorization of the surface transportation program, I do not know if we will get that done. That means jobs. That means our economy. We know that we have to be more competitive as a country. We know we are involved in global competition. The countries that we compete with are putting much more of their economy into transportation than we are into infrastructure. We must do a better job.

Well, the Federal partnership in constructing the roads, the bridges, and the transit systems is called MAP-21. It expires at the end of July—again. This is not the first time. We have not reauthorized the 6-year program for a long time. We need a 6-year program. Why? Because when you enter into a transportation project, it is more than just a 2-month commitment or a 10-month commitment. Our States cannot go into these multiyear projects unless they know they have a Federal partner. The only way they know they have a Federal partner is if we give them the certainty of a 6-year reauthorization bill.

So it is critically important. So what should we do? Starting now, the committees of jurisdiction need to have hearings and working sessions and re-

port out legislation. That should be done now. There needs to be a commitment as to what schedule will be followed so we do not miss this deadline. That was the commitment that the leadership gave us—that we will get this done in this 2-month period.

Well, unless our committees are working to come together with legislation—in the Environment and Public Works Committee, which both the Presiding Officer and I serve on, we need to bring out a bill. We have done it before. The Senate Finance Committee, which I serve on, is responsible for the financial aspects on how we get together on that.

I am going to come back to that in one moment. Of course the banking committee is responsible for the transit section, as are other committees involved. But let me make an observation; that is, yes, we have to come out with a 6-year reauthorization. That is critical. We do not want any more short-term extensions. Secondly, it has to be a robust program.

We know that if we just reauthorize at the current level, it will be inadequate. We know that. We know that, each of us in talking to our State transportation agencies. They tell you they need a more robust Federal partnership and that the challenges today are more expensive. And we have delayed for so long that it is even more expensive. So we need to come to grips with a 6-year reauthorization but at a level that will allow for a stronger Federal partnership.

The President's number is \$478 billion over 6 years. I think that is a reasonable level. If we just have a level-funded adjusted-for-inflation program, it would be \$331 billion. I would hope that we would recognize that the additional \$147 billion the President is talking about over 6 years is a modest increase but an important increase to the Federal share to deal with our urgent needs of safety, economic development, jobs, and competitiveness.

Now, here is the problem. As to the current revenues in the transportation trust fund, if we just use the \$331 billion, which is basically a freeze adjusted for inflation for the next 6 years, there is a \$97 billion gap. We do not have enough money projected in the transportation trust fund for a basically stand-still 6-year reauthorization. We are \$97 billion short.

So we need to come to grips as to how we are going to fill that void. I said I serve on the Senate Finance Committee. There are lots of revenues that go into the trust fund that we should look at adjusting. There are other ideas about how we can bring in transportation revenues. I hope we look at all of that. Then there has been the recommendation that has been done by both Democrats and Republicans. We have to find a way to bridge the gap here. It does not do any good if we just have one party that agrees on how to deal with this. We all have to deal with it.

It is incumbent upon the Republican leadership to get engaged in that debate—and the Democratic leadership. We have already said that we are open to the current revenues that go into the transportation trust fund. But there is one area that seems to be in agreement between Democrats and Republicans, and that is looking at international reform. We have all talked about the fact that we have a lot of earnings from our corporations—American corporations—that are trapped overseas because the companies have made a decision not to repatriate the money back into the United States because it would be subject to a higher U.S. corporate tax rate.

They do not want to pay that higher tax. That is a business decision made by U.S. businesses. Now, obviously, the way to solve that is to reform our business taxes here. Senator THUNE and I are cochairing a working group of the Senate Finance Committee to try to come to grips with that. It is going to be difficult for us to do that. You heard the numbers I have already given you.

But every 1-percent reduction in the corporate tax rate costs about \$100 billion over 10 years. If you include relief for those who pay the personal tax rates for their business income, it is probably closer to \$150 or \$160 billion to get a 1-percent reduction in the corporate tax rate. So that is going to be challenging.

In the meantime, there have been recommendations in order to unleash those funds: Why don't we find a charge that is less than the full corporate tax for those revenues that are returned to the United States? We have Democrats and Republicans working together on a bill, including the President, who has submitted that in his budget. He has submitted a toll charge for the revenues that are trapped overseas that corporations would have to pay.

That toll charge would be at a 14-percent rate. Then he has projected a minimum tax on foreign earnings at 19 percent that would have to be paid with certain reforms on trying to move the United States more to a territorial corporate tax rate. I mention that because I think there is interest by both Democrats and Republicans to take a look at reforming the way we tax foreign income for American companies so that we can have greater economic activity here in the United States. These proposals generate a significant amount of revenue, both one-time-only and permanent revenue.

I mention that because we could take a look at the international tax reform proposals. Democrats and Republicans have both submitted proposals on this. That could help us get to a robust 6-year reauthorization of the surface transportation bill. We could get that. My reason for mentioning it right now is this: Let's talk about it. Let's have the Republicans come to the table and talk about it also. Let's not just wait these next 2 weeks, go into the work

period, come back, and be faced with another deadline with no game plan on how we are going to resolve it and say: We have to pass another short-term extension so we can get together and talk about it.

Let's start talking about this now. I tell you that there are viable options. The one thing I found is that Democrats and Republicans agree that infrastructure is important and we have to have a stronger program in this country for infrastructure. I always enjoy hearing from Senator INHOFE, the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, a person with whom I came to the Congress. He says frequently that he may be a conservative but when it comes to infrastructure spending, it is important that we have a robust Federal program.

Under his leadership and under Senator BOXER's leadership, we have been able to bring out bills from the Environment and Public Works Committee to reauthorize a 6-year program. The challenge is this: Can we find the revenue? Of course, there we need to work together as Democrats and Republicans. So I come to the floor to urge my colleagues: Let's work together. That is what the American people expect us to do. They expect us to work together to solve the problem.

I don't think there is a Member of the Senate who would disagree that we should have a robust reauthorization of a 6-year transportation program for this country, that our States need it, that our country needs it, and that we need it for our economy. Let's put aside our own individual differences. Let's sit down and work out a bill. Let's start working it out now. Let's not wait until the next deadline.

I urge my colleagues to do this. That is what the American people want us to do. That is what we need to do to move this country forward.

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. MENENDEZ, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MENENDEZ, Madam President, I know we are on the national defense bill and, of course, national defense is ultimately about national security, and one of the concerns I have about national security and our national interests is the challenge of a nuclear-armed Iran.

I came to the floor last week to say that when it comes to dealing with Iran—as we count down to the deadline for an agreement—the truth is always elusive. I said then that international inspectors reported that Tehran's stockpile of nuclear fuel, rather than decreasing, actually increased by 20 percent.

Now, in the last days before the agreement deadline is reached, David

Albright, a well-respected expert on Iran's nuclear program, in an article for the Institute for Science and International Security, says that the State Department's explanation of Iran's newly produced 3.5 percent enriched uranium falls short and that the State Department seemed to be making excuses for the fact that Iran has not reduced its enrichment level, which they agreed to do in the Joint Plan of Action. The fact is uranium enrichment, when taken to the maximum, can lead to bomb material. So reducing the enrichment level is critical, in terms of possible breakout time in Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon.

Albright says:

The core of the State Department's explanation in the last few days appears to be that Iran meets the conditions of the Joint Plan of Action once it feeds newly produced low enriched uranium hexafluoride gas into the uranium conversion plant at Esfahan. . . .

Now, to bring this down into lay terms, this conversion plant is there to take this enriched uranium—that if further enriched, can lead to bomb material—to transform the enriched uranium that can be prepared for potential nuclear material to an oxide form, and that is a form in which the bomb threat is dramatically reduced.

But the Esfahan plant didn't even become operational until the fall of 2014, a year after it was supposed to have opened, and—conveniently for the Iranians—it is having operational difficulties, making it highly unlikely Iran can convert the low-enriched uranium hexafluoride, which we are concerned about, into enriched uranium dioxide used for making nuclear power reactor fuel.

Put simply, at the end of the day, once again Iran will not have lived up to what they agreed to.

Now, we knew from the beginning it was going to be a challenge. We knew it was going to be difficult for the Iranians to blend down their nuclear fuel, rather than to ship it out to another country, which so far they have refused to do. We knew it would be a concern if they weren't able to convert low-enriched uranium hexafluoride into the enriched uranium dioxide—the one in which, obviously, we have far less concerns. And, frankly, because that is obviously a problem, I am concerned, because as the Albright article states, “The amounts of LEU amount to about 4,000 kilograms of 3.5 LEU hexafluoride, enough to potentially make 2 to 3 nuclear weapons if further enriched to weapons-grade uranium.”

Two to three nuclear weapons if further enriched to nuclear-grade uranium. Now, I am concerned this is more blue smoke and mirrors that overlooked the real ambitions of an untrustworthy negotiating partner. I am concerned Iran is still saying it will not ship out excess low-enriched uranium but somehow blend it down and store it at the plant, which can't possibly blend down enough at this point to meet the requirements under the Joint Plan of Action.

I am concerned this is more of an issue than the administration is willing to concede, particularly if, at the end, there is no deal and we, through sanctions relief, paid them to convert and then they walk away with massive amounts of low-enriched uranium that can be fed into their centrifuges and be easily converted to highly enriched uranium and on to weapons-grade uranium.

According to David Albright:

Based on the IAEA's report—

That is the International Atomic Energy Administration's report to member states—

the problems in making enriched uranium oxide were apparent by the fall of 2014 . . . but the Administration decided not to make a major issue about the lack of oxide production.

The article goes on to say:

Concluding that Iran has met the Joint Plan of Action condition to convert to oxide newly-enriched up to 5 percent is incorrect.

And it further says:

In this case, the potential violation refers to Iran not producing the enriched oxide at the end of the initial six month period of the Joint Plan of Action and again after its first extension.

This is a continuing quote:

The choosing of a weaker condition which must be met cannot be a good precedent for interpreting more important provisions in a final deal. Moreover, it tends to confirm the view of critics that future violations of a long-term deal will be downplayed for the sake of generating or maintaining support for the deal.

It says:

The administration relied on a technical remedy that Iran had not demonstrated it could carry out.

The article concludes:

The State Department has some explaining to do.

Now, the enrichment issue is one thing, but then there is the recently released U.N. Security Council report on a whole host of the existing Security Council resolutions and mandates as it relates to Iran, and there are other problems as well. They are well documented in this just recently released report; that Iran has continued to deny the legitimacy of Security Council resolutions not addressed in the Joint Plan of Action; that Iran's arms transfers have actively continued, raising concerns in particular in the region; that cases of noncompliance with the travel ban have also been observed; that Iran has continued certain nuclear activities, including enrichment and work at Arak; and that there is no progress by Iran in addressing possible military dimensions that had been agreed to be addressed by Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency. The most troubling relates to allegations of large-scale high-explosives experimentation at Parchin.

The report goes on to talk about Iran's missile technology. Here we have a sense from the U.N. Security Council's report where it speaks to Iran's missile capability. And I am using a

map here that I give credit to the New York Times for to demonstrate what that means. Iran has two kinds of ballistic missiles capable of delivering a nuclear weapon, according to the report—the Ghadr missile, which is a variation of the liquid-fuel Shahab-3, with a range of about 1,600 kilometers, or 995 miles, and the other is the Sejil missile, with a range of about 2,000 kilometers, or about 1,250 miles. The first missile encompasses most of the gulf and certainly our ally, the State of Israel, as well as Afghanistan and Pakistan, not to mention Turkey, among others, and then the longer range missile actually goes as far as into Europe. And this is missile technology that is still in development. As the U.N. Security Council report points out, we can see the range of Iran's missiles and the potential military dimensions of its pursuits.

Then there is the issue of arms embargo violations and the transfer of conventional arms. For whatever reasons—and the report speculates that maybe member states, meaning member countries of the United Nations, don't want to upset the apple cart of the negotiations—there have been no reports—even in the midst of very clear violations taking place, and those have been largely reported—from member states of the U.N. about the transfer of conventional arms by Iran. But the U.N. report nevertheless says that “the panel notes media reports pointing to continued military support and alleged arms transfers to Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Yemen, and to Hezbollah and Hamas.”

The report also says that a shipment of arms was confirmed by Massoud Barzani, president of Kurdistan's regional government, who said: “We asked for weapons and Iran was the first country to provide [them].” This is a clear violation if ever there were one.

According to the report, some member states informed the panel that Iran's nuclear procurement trends and circumvention techniques remain basically unchanged. In fact, Great Britain informed the U.N. panel that they are aware of an active Iranian nuclear procurement network associated with Iran's centrifuge technology company known as TESA and Kalay Electric Company, which are listed sanction entities under the U.N. Security Council resolutions.

The report further says that member states have reported on the methods Iran has used and continues to use to carry out financial transactions below the radar to conceal any connection to Iran. Some states that import oil, for example, have authorized their banks to receive payments into accounts belonging to the Central Bank of Iran. The funds were reportedly paid out against invoices for exports of goods to Iran although the goods were never exported, meaning money was taken out and ultimately made its way to Iran even though they were not for payment

of anything because nothing was shipped.

The simple fact is—and there are many other examples in the U.N. Security Council report, to which I commend my colleagues' attention—we can't trust Iran to abide by its agreements or to abide by U.N. resolutions even when they are in the midst of negotiations, when you would think they would be behaving the best. One would think they would want to put their best foot forward. Why would we think we can trust them if they are violating U.N. Security Council resolutions? That is the world—not the United States, not even the P5+1, but the world—telling them they can't do these things or they violate an international order. So why would we think we could trust them not to enrich uranium, not to pursue a weapons program, and not to find any way possible to renege on any agreement they reach when they are violating existing Security Council resolutions?

As I have said, I will come to the floor to reiterate my skepticism that Iran will not do all it can to pursue their agenda. I believe, rather, they will try to find a way to pursue their agenda, to play fast and loose with the truth, to hide the truth, to cover it up, and to buy time. Iran needs to be held responsible for its commitments—forget about its work; its commitments. There can be no slippage, no delays, no obfuscation. That is how they succeeded in the past in bringing themselves to be on the verge of becoming a threshold nuclear state.

So where do we go from here? It remains to be seen whether compliance with that which has already been agreed to by the Iranians—even at this early stage while the world is watching—can be realized or will it be explained away.

I intend to come to the floor again and again to hold Iran accountable for its actions and to keep a laser-like focus on the mullahs in Tehran. I fear that when that spotlight is off, when the press is gone, when the agreement is out of the headlines and the curtain closes on the P5+1 talks, Iran will pull back into the shadows. When that happens and if it goes wrong, what will we do then?

We haven't seen the final agreement, so we will have to wait to make a final judgment on it. But if the final agreement follows in the line of the framework agreement, then we will have a set of circumstances where we will not be solving the problem. I think some of the experts who were before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday in a briefing admitted to the fact—and one or two of them are proponents of an agreement—they said this does not solve the problem but only kicks the problem down the road.

Those are hard choices no matter what, but I would rather confront a country that is on the path to nuclear weapons before it gets it and when it is at its weakest point, not when it be-

comes a country at its stronger point, with far more resources, with sanctions that have largely dissipated. And even with snapback provisions—which I think we should have, but several years down the road when the world has now engaged Iran in doing business and Iran has risen in its economy—its economy has already stopped its free-fall just on the basis of expectations—and it decides possibly to break out 3 or 4 years down the road, putting all of those international sanctions back together, as someone who was the author of those sanctions here in the Congress, I can tell you that is going to take a lot more work. There is no instantaneous snapback: Oh, we will put the sanctions back and they will have effect immediately. You have to tell the world, you have to give them notice that, in fact, there are sanctions back in effect. You have to tell companies now doing business and give them time to disinvest from those businesses. By the time you add that, if experience is a good barometer, we gave at a minimum 6 months' lead time to tell the world this is going to be a sanctionable activity, and by the time we actually pursued enforcement and implementation of those, it was far beyond—close to a year. Well, that happens to be the time we are actually vying for breakout time.

So I am going to continue to come to the floor to continue to shine a spotlight on the challenges we have with Iran and on the shortcomings of the interim agreement as we hope for a good final agreement. But I will use the refrain that the administration at one time used, which is that no agreement is better than a bad agreement, and that is what my concern is—that we are headed toward a bad agreement.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Arizona.

EARMARKS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a problem that, despite a congressional ban on the practice, continues to plague our budget. That problem is earmarks.

Back in 1986—just a little history lesson here—as Congress engaged in a last-minute scramble to fund the government, a Republican Congressman from Pennsylvania slipped an earmark into a massive spending bill. He turned a small exhibit of steam-powered trains, known as Steamtown USA, into a national park. Three decades, nearly \$100 million, and one congressional earmark ban later, that project continues to cost taxpayers millions of dollars annually. The bridge to nowhere, the North Carolina teapot museum, the indoor rainforest in Iowa, and, yes, Steamtown USA, are among the many egregious earmarks that led fed-up taxpayers to press for a ban on this kind of spending.

Like triceratops and velociraptors, earmarks that were declared extinct, fossilized relics of a bygone era, are somehow making a reappearance. What taxpayers and many in Congress didn't

realize is that despite the successful ban on earmarks, we are still paying millions of dollars for the old ones. Through unexpended funds, carve-outs in the Tax Code, and grant awards, spending on past earmark projects and their recipients still roam the Federal budget landscape.

Today, I am releasing a report—“Jurassic Pork”—which will highlight the fossilized pork projects that are still embedded or buried deep in the Federal budget. It should serve as a reminder of the past scandals that brought about the extinction of earmarks and serve as a warning that the cost of earmarking often outlives the practice itself.

“Jurassic Pork” digs into just two dozen of the many earmarked projects and recipients of congressional bounty that continue to cost taxpayers millions of dollars.

Take for example the aptly named *VelociRFTA*, a bus rapid transit system in Colorado that covers the 40 miles between Aspen and Glenwood that began as an \$810,000 earmark. Since the earmark ban took place in 2010, thanks to continued Federal funding, this project—this vestige—has cost taxpayers \$36 million.

Also highlighted in the report is the American Ballet Theater, which supplemented a flow of Federal grant money with more than \$800,000 in earmarked funds from a Member of Congress who also happened to perform in one of the group’s recent productions.

Then there are the 6,000 unspent highway earmarks representing \$5.9 billion that sit idle in the Department of Transportation account. These include pork projects such as the \$600,000 Upper Delaware Scenic Byway Visitor Center in Cocheton, NY. Unfortunately for taxpayers, the visitor center ended up being built in Narrowsburg. Because the location was specified as Cocheton, the money will likely continue to sit on the Federal Government’s ledger.

Now, within these unspent transportation earmarks, there is a smaller group that is often referred to as “orphan” earmarks. These are earmarks that have had less than 10 percent of their expended—or their anticipated funds spent over 10 years. According to the Congressional Research Service, 70 earmarks worth more than \$120 million remain on the books, and in August 2015, more than 1,200 earmarks from the last major highway bill that was passed in 2005 will officially become orphan earmarks. These represent \$2 billion in yet-to-be-spent funds.

With the near bankrupt highway trust fund, Congress needs to find a way to permanently park these unspent funds. To that end, I have also introduced a Jurassic Pork Act, which will rescind funding for orphan earmarks and will return this money to the highway trust fund. We all know the highway trust fund could use it about now.

Now, like John Hammond, the billionaire CEO of the failed theme park

in the first “Jurassic Park” film, not everyone in Congress is content to leave these as relics of the past. Not a year after the earmark ban was implemented in the Senate, the then-majority leader proclaimed: “I’ve done earmarks all my career, and I’m happy I’ve done earmarks all my career.”

Others from both sides of the aisle have argued that a return to earmarking would help to lard up or incentivize votes. But taxpayers don’t exist for political horse trading or as a reward for powerful Members to dole out as tributes. Taxpayers need to remain vigilant against all this kind of parochial spending, and we cannot return to pork as we knew it.

The moratorium on earmarks in 2010 didn’t put an end to these kind of shenanigans. But as readers of “Jurassic Pork” will see, the spending on their legacy continues. Taxpayers have already seen the end of this movie. We don’t need to be treated to a sequel.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LEE. I ask for regular order with respect to Vitter amendment No. 1473.

AMENDMENT NO. 1687 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1473, AS MODIFIED

Mr. LEE. I send a second-degree amendment, Lee amendment No. 1687, to the desk as a second-degree amendment to Vitter amendment No. 1473 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE] proposes an amendment numbered 1687 to amendment No. 1473, as modified.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for the protection and recovery of the greater sage-grouse, the conservation of lesser prairie-chicken, and the removal of endangered species status for the American burying beetle)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROTECTION AND RECOVERY OF GREATER SAGE GROUSE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “Federal resource management plan” means—

(A) a land use plan prepared by the Bureau of Land Management for public lands pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712); or

(B) a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for National

Forest System lands pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

(2) The term “Greater Sage Grouse” means a sage grouse of the species *Centrocercus urophasianus*.

(3) The term “State management plan” means a State-approved plan for the protection and recovery of the Greater Sage Grouse.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is—

(1) to facilitate implementation of State management plans over a period of multiple, consecutive sage grouse life cycles; and

(2) to demonstrate the efficacy of the State management plans for the protection and recovery of the Greater Sage Grouse.

(c) ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973 FINDINGS.—

(1) DELAY REQUIRED.—Any finding by the Secretary of the Interior under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(3)(B)) with respect to the Greater Sage Grouse made during the period beginning on September 30, 2015, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall have no force or effect in law or in equity, and the Secretary of the Interior may not make any such finding during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 2025.

(2) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—The delay imposed by paragraph (1) is, and shall remain, effective without regard to any other statute, regulation, court order, legal settlement, or any other provision of law or in equity.

(3) EFFECT ON CONSERVATION STATUS.—Until the date specified in paragraph (1), the conservation status of the Greater Sage Grouse shall remain warranted for listing under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but precluded by higher-priority listing actions pursuant to clause (iii) of section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(3)(B)).

(d) COORDINATION OF FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND STATE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON MODIFICATION OF FEDERAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.—In order to foster coordination between a State management plan and Federal resource management plans that affect the Greater Sage Grouse, upon notification by the Governor of a State with a State management plan, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may not amend or otherwise modify any Federal resource management plan applicable to Federal lands in the State in a manner inconsistent with the State management plan for a period, to be specified by the Governor in the notification, of at least five years beginning on the date of the notification.

(2) RETROACTIVE EFFECT.—In the case of any State that provides notification under paragraph (1), if any amendment or modification of a Federal resource management plan applicable to Federal lands in the State was issued during the one-year period preceding the date of the notification and the amendment or modification altered management of the Greater Sage Grouse or its habitat, implementation and operation of the amendment or modification shall be stayed to the extent that the amendment or modification is inconsistent with the State management plan. The Federal resource management plan, as in effect immediately before the amendment or modification, shall apply instead with respect to management of the Greater Sage Grouse and its habitat, to the extent consistent with the State management plan.

(3) DETERMINATION OF INCONSISTENCY.—Any disagreement regarding whether an amendment or other modification of a Federal resource management plan is inconsistent with a State management plan shall be resolved by the Governor of the affected State.

(e) RELATION TO NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.—With regard to any Federal action consistent with a State management plan, any findings, analyses, or conclusions regarding the Greater Sage Grouse or its habitat under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.) shall not have a preclusive effect on the approval or implementation of the Federal action in that State.

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter through 2021, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the Secretaries' implementation and effectiveness of systems to monitor the status of Greater Sage Grouse on Federal lands under their jurisdiction.

(g) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statute or regulation, this section, including determinations made under subsection (d)(3), shall not be subject to judicial review.

SEC. ____ . IMPLEMENTATION OF LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN RANGE-WIDE CONSERVATION PLAN AND OTHER CONSERVATION MEASURES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CANDIDATE CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS.—The terms "Candidate Conservation Agreement" and "Candidate and Conservation Agreement With Assurances" have the meaning given those terms in—

(A) the announcement of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce entitled "Announcement of Final Policy for Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances" (64 Fed. Reg. 32726 (June 17, 1999)); and

(B) sections 17.22(d) and 17.32(d) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

(2) RANGE-WIDE PLAN.—The term "Range-Wide Plan" means the Lesser Prairie-Chicken Range-Wide Conservation Plan of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, as endorsed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on October 23, 2013, and published for comment on January 29, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 4652).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) PROHIBITION ON TREATMENT AS THREATENED OR ENDANGERED SPECIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any prior action by the Secretary, the lesser prairie-chicken shall not be treated as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) before January 31, 2021.

(2) PROHIBITION ON PROPOSAL.—Effective beginning on January 31, 2021, the lesser prairie-chicken may not be treated as a threatened species or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) unless the Secretary publishes a determination, based on the totality of the scientific evidence, that conservation (as that term is used in that Act) under the Range-Wide Plan and the agreements, programs, and efforts referred to in subsection (c) have not achieved the conservation goals established by the Range-Wide Plan.

(c) MONITORING OF PROGRESS OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall monitor and annually submit to Congress a report on progress in conservation of the lesser

prairie-chicken under the Range-Wide Plan and all related—

(1) Candidate Conservation Agreements and Candidate and Conservation Agreements With Assurances;

(2) other Federal conservation programs administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Department of Agriculture;

(3) State conservation programs; and

(4) private conservation efforts.

SEC. ____ . REMOVAL OF ENDANGERED SPECIES STATUS FOR AMERICAN BURYING BEETLE.

Notwithstanding the final rule of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the American Burying Beetle" (54 Fed. Reg. 29652 (July 13, 1989)), the American burying beetle shall not be listed as a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. MCCAIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am fully aware that we are not going to be able to get past a unanimous consent request, but I wanted to make sure the Chair knew and others know that we have an amendment that I will do the best I can to bring out.

It is an amendment that already has 21 cosponsors. There is a provision in the Senate bill that was put in by the Senate that is not in the House bill that has to do with commissaries. It is viewed upon as privatizing commissaries. It is not really that. It is an attempt to evaluate the idea of the commissaries being privatized by using five commissaries as test cells to see what kind of result we would get if we did privatize them.

What we are doing with my amendment is taking it back—taking that language out—in order to go ahead with an assessment before we do that. It wouldn't make sense to me that if we wanted to get this done, even if we felt very passionately about privatizing, that we would do it before we had an assessment. So the assessment would be first.

We had a lot of discussion about this in the Senate Armed Services Committee. As I said, we now have 21 cosponsors who would like to reverse this so we can do the assessment and then make the determination.

It is kind of interesting, even though most people say privatizing is not going to actually save or make any money, the amendment simply requires the assessment on privatizing before we make any significant changes to our servicemembers' privatized commissary benefits. This is something that is very popular among members of our service, wives, and husbands, when surveyed last year. Approximately, 95 percent of the servicemembers were using the commissaries to purchase household goods to achieve needed savings in their family budgets with a 91-percent satisfaction rate. We don't get 91 percent satisfaction rates around here very often. The language in this bill as it is now ignores the recommendations made by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission that we are all very familiar with. In the report released in January, it specifically stated, in recommendation No. 8, "to protect access and savings to DOD commissaries and exchanges." Well, that is exactly what we want to do.

I have a very impressive list, which I will not read, of 41 organizations and associations, including labor unions, the Gold Star Widows, American Veterans, and others, and I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING INHOFE/MIKULSKI AMENDMENT

1. National Military and Veterans Alliance
2. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations Teamsters
3. The Coalition to Save Our Military Shopping Benefits
4. National Guard Association of the United States
5. Military Officers Association of America
6. American Federation of Government Employees
7. Veterans of Foreign Wars
8. Armed Forces Marketing Council
9. American Logistics Association
10. American Military Retirees Association
11. American Military Society
12. American Retirees Association
13. Army and Navy Union
14. Gold Star Widows
15. International Brotherhood of Teamsters
16. Military Order of Foreign Wars
17. Military Order of the Purple Heart
18. National Association for Uniformed Services
19. National Defense Committee
20. Society of Military Widows
21. The Flag and General Officers Network
22. Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors
23. Uniformed Services Disabled Retirees
24. Vietnam Veterans of America
25. Fleet Reserve Association
26. National Military Family Association
27. Military Officers Association of America
28. The Retired Enlisted Association
29. Association of the United States Army
30. American Veterans
31. United States Army Warrant Officers Association
32. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America
33. Association of the United States Navy

- 34. Air Force Sergeants Association
- 35. Military Partners and Families Coalition
- 36. National Association for Uniformed Services
- 37. American Military Retirees Association
- 38. The American Military Partner Association
- 39. American Logistics Association
- 40. Reserve Officer Association
- 41. Air Force Association

Mr. INHOFE. I also have a synopsis of letters of support that is from six different organizations, including the Military Officers Association of America; the Armed Forces Marketing Council; the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO; the American Military Retirees Association; and saveourbenefit.org.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the synopsis of these six letters representing these organizations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA: "This amendment requires a study in lieu of the Senate Armed Service Committee (SASC) language that mandate a privatization pilot in at least five commissaries chosen from the commissary agency's largest U.S. markets. MOAA commends this approach. To conduct a privatization pilot without proper assessment could result in unintended consequences, putting this highly valued benefit at risk. The commissary is a vital part of military compensation providing a significant benefit to military families. The average family of four who shops exclusively at the commissary sees a savings of up to 30 percent."

ARMED FORCES MARKETING COUNCIL: "What is at stake for military families: Loss of up to 30% savings on a market basket of products for military families. That equates to over \$4000 per year for a family of four. Loss of jobs for military family members. Over 60 percent of DeCA employees are military related and their jobs are transferable, allowing them to retain their positions and seniority when the military provides permanent change of station orders. Families would be required to pay sales taxes on groceries. Loss of a cherished benefit that is enjoyed by 95% of the active force. Loss of traffic at commissaries will adversely impact sales in military exchanges by up to 40%. This will diminish the dividend that supports quality of life programs for military families."

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS: "The commissary system is a vital benefit to our nation's active military, their families, and veterans across the country. The system provides thousands of jobs for American Teamsters in the warehouse, shipping, and food distribution industries. Commissaries also provide a needed benefit for military spouses and family members, who make up nearly 30 percent of Department of Commissary employees."

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (AFL-CIO): "The Department of Defense's (DoD) commissaries and exchanges (Army and Air Force Exchange Service, AAFES) are an earned benefit treasured by military families and an important contributor to their quality of life. The modest cost of providing military families with inexpensive but essential goods and services is almost invisible in the Department's overall budget. Given that privatization of the commissaries has been repeatedly rejected by the executive and legislative branches and

that this option was explicitly not recommended by a recent commission which looked comprehensively at the commissaries, it makes no sense to begin to privatize the commissaries before understanding the impact on costs and services as well as morale and recruitment. Senator Inhofe's amendment would wisely direct DoD to study the impact of privatization, and the Government Accountability Office to review the DoD's finding, before the Department is directed to privatize the commissaries."

AMERICAN MILITARY RETIREES ASSOCIATION: "The American Military Retirees Association believes commissary and exchanges are a vital part of military pay and compensation. Ninety percent of the military community uses these benefits and consistently rank[s] them as a top compensation benefit, yielding returns that far outweigh taxpayer support. They also provide critical jobs for military families and veterans—over 60 percent of employees are military affiliated—and provide healthy living alternatives both stateside and overseas."

SAVEOURBENEFIT.ORG: "The Inhofe-Mikulski amendment offers a sensible, pragmatic and thoughtful approach to examining private operation of military commissaries. Senators Inhofe and Mikulski are right. Study before deciding to implement. Nearly 40 organizations—representing tens of millions of active duty, Guard and Reserve, retirees, military families, veterans and survivors—agree. The Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (MCRMC) surveyed the private sector and found no interest among major retailers to operate on military bases. The Commission, chartered by the Senate, found that commissaries were worth preserving and recommended changes to the current structure—not privatization."

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my intention, as soon as we get to the point where we can get into the queue and get unanimous consent to set the current business aside—it would be my intention to do that to consider this amendment.

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. MCCAIN. 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. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on amendment No. 1569 be moved to 3 p.m. today. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call up the following amendments: Ernst No. 1549, Gillibrand No. 1578, Whitehouse No. 1693, Fischer-Booker No. 1825, Collins No. 1660, Cardin No. 1468; that at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, June 16, the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed: Fischer-Booker No. 1825; Collins No. 1660; Cardin No. 1468; Gillibrand No. 1578; Ernst No. 1549; Whitehouse No. 1693; Durbin No. 1559, as modified; and Paul No. 1543; that there be no second-degree amendments in order to any of these amendments prior to the votes, and that the Gillibrand, Ernst, Whitehouse, Durbin, and Paul amendments require a 60-affirmative-vote threshold for adoption; also,

that there be 2 minutes equally divided between the votes and that all votes after the first be 10 minutes in length.

I further ask that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the McCain substitute amendment No. 1463 occur at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, June 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I initially say to my impatient friend, he has to be patient and allow me to say a few words. During the short time we have been in the minority, we have behaved in a way that I think is proper for a responsible minority. For example, on this bill dealing with the authorization of our defense capacity in the United States, we have been very clear how we support the troops. But remember, we have this little difficult issue. The President of the United States has said he is going to veto this bill. So we have worked through all this with that in mind. Having said that, in spite of that, we did not ask for a cloture vote on the motion to proceed. When we were in the majority, having the minority not do that was a big day. It happened extremely rarely. We have been doing that consistently—with some exceptions but not many.

On this Defense bill, we have allowed amendments to become pending. There are a dozen or so pending right now. We have allowed the Senate to conduct votes. We have allowed managers' amendments to be cleared—lots of them. We have reacted in a responsible way. We have no regret for having done that.

The two managers were working together to get amendments pending in a mutually agreed-upon fashion when out of the blue, up comes this cyber security amendment. It was also done in a very unusual way where Senator BURR employed parliamentary devices to get the cyber security bill pending to where we are right now. We could have been playing around all week with our offering amendments, but I have always felt that it should be done extremely rarely, for the minority to do something like that. We could have done that.

If you look at the amendments that have been offered by us Democrats, they are all, with rare exception, dealing with the security of this Nation—not sage grouse, not all the other things the Republicans have brought up in this bill.

To say that the Ex-Im Bank and the cyber security amendments have impeded progress is a gross understatement. The cyber security bill is a major bill in its own way—a major bill. I can speak with some authority in this regard. Five years ago, I got every committee chair who had jurisdiction over this subject and we met over a period of days to come up with a cyber security bill. We did that. Republicans stopped us. We kept getting a smaller

group of people involved as we were narrowing the bill, and we actually were scheduled to finally have a vote on the cyber security bill. It wasn't as good as I thought we should have, but it was an important bill. And what happened on that? The chamber of commerce made a call to some of the Republican leaders in the Senate, and suddenly that bill was gone and we were voting on another ObamaCare amendment that, of course, went nowhere.

But we have tried cyber security.

The Intelligence Committee reported out this bill, and I appreciate that they did. It was on a bipartisan basis, but it also contains a lot of matter within the jurisdiction of other committees—for example, the Homeland Security Committee and the Judiciary Committee.

To her credit, the ranking member, Senator FEINSTEIN, recognized that and went to the Democrats and said: We will work with you and make sure the problems you have with this bill when it gets to the floor—we will work with you on this.

Senator FEINSTEIN is a person of her word. I know she will do that, and she will do that.

This morning, the Republican leader, who is on the floor, was saying that we just had an attack on 4 million people and that it is Obama's fault. I think that is stretching things a little bit, especially recognizing that I have only given a brief travel through the times we have tried to get up the cyber security legislation. We should take the time to do it right.

I have told the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and I have checked with our ranking member of the Finance Committee, who is extremely interested—and hasn't been for 10 minutes or 10 days or 10 months but 10 years—in privacy. He has been our leader on privacy on this side of the aisle, and he believes we could finish it, if we had a free shot at this cyber bill, in a couple of days—and I agree with him—at the most. So we are not trying to avoid cyber. I believe—we believe it is an important part of what we need to do. But we should take time to do it right. We should not be tacking this important piece of legislation onto a bill the President has already said he is going to veto just so the Republicans can blame Obama for vetoing this bill as well.

If the majority would withdraw their cyber amendment and agree to take it up after this bill, we could do it in a couple of days and then we could return to working on the Defense bill. But we cannot take up all these new amendments my friend the chairman of the committee wants to set up votes on—we have the 9 he talks about, plus 6; that is 15—until we resolve this matter dealing with cyber security.

So without belaboring the point—and I appreciate my impatient friend being patient with me and listening to me go through all of this—I ask the majority leader or my friend the chairman of the

Armed Services Committee if he would modify his consent request as follows.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to amendment No. 1569—that is cyber security—as modified, be withdrawn; that the pending amendment No. 1569—again, that is cyber security—as modified, be withdrawn; and that upon the disposition of H.R. 1735, the Defense authorization bill, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 28, S. 754. That is the bill which came out of the Intelligence Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am going to propose a modification of the consent request propounded by the Democratic leader: that following disposition of H.R. 2685, the Defense appropriations bill, the Senate turn to consideration of S. 754, the cyber security measure reported by the Senate Intelligence Committee. I further ask that there be 10 relevant amendments to be offered by each bill manager or designee, with 1 hour of debate followed by a vote on the amendments offered, with a 60-vote threshold on those amendments that are not germane to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader?

The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to my friend's modification, I repeat, the cyber security bill is important and the Senate should turn to it, but putting it after the Defense appropriations bill is a false promise. It is a facade. I think it is very clear. I heard the Republican leader give a speech on the floor today that he knows, unless there are some changes made, we are not going to get on the Defense appropriations bill. So this is a false promise.

If we could do it in a more specific, determined time, that would be one thing, but the Republican leader obviously has no plan to complete the Defense appropriations bill if this is how we are proceeding; rather, they are proceeding ahead with his partisan budget plan—a plan the President said will not become law.

Until Republicans sit down to work out a bipartisan Senate budget, the Senate will not finish the Defense authorization bill. Once again, the right way to do this would be to consider the cyber security bill on its own merits after the Defense authorization bill is done. It would take 2 days.

So I ask the majority leader if he would modify his consent request to the following: that upon disposition of the Defense authorization bill, H.R. 1735, the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 28, S. 754, which is the cyber security bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will

object, I will point out that the Defense appropriations bill was reported out of the Appropriations Committee today with only three members voting against it. There was a lot of discussion about the Democratic leader saying "We are not going to pass the bill," but when the votes were counted, only three members—all on the Democratic side but only three—voted against reporting the bill out of committee.

My good friend the Democratic leader and I have had this discussion back and forth, but one of the advantages of being in the majority is that we set the schedule, and we are going to do the Defense appropriations bill after we do the Defense authorization bill; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader?

Mr. REID. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Does the Senator from Arizona modify his request with the request of the Democratic leader?

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, may I make a couple of comments real quick before the distinguished majority leader modifies his request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. I would remind my good friend from Nevada, the Democratic leader, for the last 2 years we took up the Defense authorization bill, and it was taken up so late there was not a single amendment—not a single, solitary amendment on the Defense authorization bill for the last 2 years. So I understand the Democratic leader's commitment to amendments. It is too bad that for 2 years we never had a single amendment to the Defense authorization bill.

As far as relevant amendments are concerned, one of the things about this body is that everybody has the right to propose an amendment until their amendments are not made germane. The three pending Democratic amendments we have now on the bill are not germane.

So all I can say is that I hope we can get a modification. I hope we can move forward.

I just wish to point out one more time what I know that my colleagues have heard over and over, and I will make it brief. Henry Kissinger testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the world has never been in more crises. This world is at risk, and we have to—we have to protect the men and women who are serving in our security. I would argue that a national defense authorization act is probably more important now than it has been at any time in recent history.

I refuse to modify my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator's original request?

Mr. REID. Which Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. REID. Yes, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on amendment No. 1569 be moved to 3 p.m. today and that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will be extremely brief. We can have a debate here. We can look at all the press clippings of both sides on what happened in the last 2 years on Defense authorization. We didn't get a bill. We got a bill, but it was done in secret by the managers of the two bills in the House and the Senate. The reason that happened—it wasn't our fault. They wouldn't let us on the bill—"they" meaning the Republicans. So we can debate that all we want. Those are the facts.

I do not object to my friend's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the McCain substitute amendment No. 1463.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the McCain amendment No. 1463 to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John McCain, Richard C. Shelby, Jeff Flake, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Jeff Sessions, Shelley Moore Capito, Lamar Alexander, Lindsey Graham, Joni Ernst, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Kelly Ayotte, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk with respect to the underlying House bill, H.R. 1735.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John McCain, Richard C. Shelby, Jeff Flake, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Jeff Sessions, Shelley Moore Capito, Lamar Alexander, Lindsey Graham, Joni Ernst, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Kelly Ayotte, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 1569, AS MODIFIED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in just a moment, the Senate will consider an important cyber security measure. I urge every one of my colleagues to support it.

USA TODAY recently cited a cyber security expert who noted that this Senate legislation has the potential to greatly reduce the number of victims targeted by the kinds of hackers we have seen in recent years. It contains modern tools to help deter future attacks against both the government and the private sector, to provide them with knowledge to erect stronger defenses, and to get the word out faster about attacks when they are detected. The top Democrat on the Intelligence Committee reminded us that the cyber security measure before us would also protect individual privacy and civil liberties. She has urged Congress to "act quickly" to deter a threat that is literally impossible to overstate.

The White House has also urged Congress to act.

The new Congress has been asked to act, and today we are, with a good, strong, transparent, bipartisan measure which has been thoroughly vetted by both parties in committee and which has been available for months—literally months—for anyone to read. It was endorsed by nearly every Democrat and every Republican on the Intelligence Committee, 14 to 1. It is also backed by a broad coalition of supporters, everyone from the chamber of commerce to the United States Telecom Association.

It is legislation that is all about protecting our country, which is why it makes perfect sense to consider it alongside defense legislation with the very same aim. Cyber security amendments can be offered, and the debate will continue.

So let's work together to advance this measure. There are now 4 million extra reasons for Congress to act quickly. The sooner we do, the sooner we can conference it with similar legislation that passed the House and get a good cyber security law enacted to help protect our country. The opportunity to begin doing that will come in a few moments with a vote for cloture on this bipartisan cyber security bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have on the Senate floor an authorization bill for about \$600 billion—Defense authorization for about \$600 billion. I can't imagine the procedural games, the chicanery involved in this. Why did we yesterday have on this bill something on Ex-Im Bank? Was it just to check it off so they could say we tried and Democrats wouldn't let us do it? Why would we have on this \$600 billion bill dealing with the security of this Nation something else that also deals with the security of this Nation and that deserves a separate piece of legislation so we can have amendments and talk about that? We have agreed to do it in a very short period of time.

There is no good reason for doing it this way. We should limit the matter at hand to the Defense authorization bill at some \$600 billion, and then we have agreed to go to cyber security. We are willing to do that. But I cannot imagine—I cannot imagine—why the Republican leader is doing this. It makes a mockery of the legislative process.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the leader yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield to the ranking member of the committee for a question.

Mr. WYDEN. Leader, I strongly oppose cloture on this cyber measure and I want to ask the Senator a question.

I think we all understand how dangerous hackers are. They are increasingly sophisticated. The most dangerous hackers rarely use the same technique twice. I believe what the Senator is saying is we can't deal with this responsibly by stapling the cyber bill to something else. Is that one of the key reasons the leader is opposing this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, respectfully, I suggest we are on leader time now. My time is protected—or used to be—and the Senator asked me a question. I yielded to him for a question. He should have the right to answer the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. I will be very brief.

I oppose cloture on the cyber measure. I think what the leader is saying is that the cyber measure is so serious we shouldn't deal with it by stapling it to something else. It is so important we ought to have an opportunity over that 2-day period to deal with it separately; is that the leader's view?

Mr. REID. Without any question.

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 bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 1569, as modified, to the McCain

amendment No. 1463 to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, David Perdue, Bob Corker, Michael B. Enzi, Susan M. Collins, Jeff Flake, Mike Rounds, Richard Burr, David Vitter, James M. Inhofe, Daniel Coats, John McCain, Deb Fischer, Tom Cotton.

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. 1569, as modified, offered by the Senator from Arizona, Mr. McCAIN, for the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BURR, to the substitute amendment No. 1463, 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 207 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Nelson
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Bennet	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Hoeben	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johnson	Shelby
Collins	King	Sullivan
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tillis
Cotton	Lankford	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Daines	McCain	Warner
Donnelly	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—40

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reid
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Heller	Sanders
Boxer	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Lee	Shaheen
Cardin	Markey	Stabenow
Carper	McCaskill	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Udall
Coons	Mikulski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Paul	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Merkley
Leahy	Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 40.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WELCOMING VISITORS FROM WHEATON COLLEGE

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, now that we concluded the vote, I would like to announce for the RECORD that I am privileged and honored to be able to host a number of people from my alma mater, Wheaton College. The board of trustees is holding a meeting here in Washington. They are visiting the Capitol and we are about to go on a tour.

I want to thank them for their service to our college and to America. They are spending a good amount of time here working through issues that are very important to the school. Wheaton College is an evangelical school that has been true to the faith in dealing with the challenges that exist today. I am pleased to be able to acknowledge that they are here visiting the Capitol, and enjoying the sites of Washington while making some tough decisions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

(The remarks of Mr. SANDERS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1564 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

FEDERAL VEHICLE REPAIR COST SAVINGS ACT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan legislation I introduced with my colleague Senator LANKFORD, the Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act.

I am pleased the Senate is considering the first bill I introduced as a Senator, which was approved by the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on a unanimous vote earlier this year.

I appreciate Senator LANKFORD partnering with me to work on this legislation in committee and as it has moved to the Senate floor. I look forward to continuing to work with him as a member of the subcommittee he chairs, the Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management Subcommittee.

I also appreciate that my colleague from Michigan Representative HUIZENGA has introduced bipartisan companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

The Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act is a bipartisan, commonsense measure that will help save taxpayers money and promote conservation by encouraging Federal agencies to use remanufactured auto parts when they are maintaining their fleets of vehicles.

In addition to saving money, this legislation also supports remanufacturing

suppliers and their employees in Michigan and across the country. Remanufactured parts are usually less expensive than similar parts and have been returned to same-as-new condition using a standardized industrial process.

The United States is the largest producer, consumer, and exporter of remanufactured goods. Remanufacturing of motor vehicle parts accounts for over 30,000 full-time U.S. jobs, and our country employs over 20,000 workers remanufacturing off-road equipment.

In addition to the cost savings using remanufactured parts, it also has significant environmental benefits. Remanufacturing saves energy by reusing raw materials such as iron, aluminum, and copper. On average, the remanufacturing process saves approximately 85 percent of the energy and material used to manufacture equivalent new products.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 565, the Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act, commonsense legislation that is good for taxpayers, our environment, and American manufacturers.

Mr. President, I also rise to support the bipartisan Ayotte-Peters amendment to authorize bilateral research and development with Israel on anti-tunnel capabilities.

I appreciate Senator AYOTTE's efforts to work together on this critical matter of national security. Israel remains our closest ally in the Middle East, and this amendment will further our shared cooperation to increase security for both Americans and Israelis.

Our ally Israel faces significant threats from underground tunnels built by terrorists intent on murdering innocent Israelis. Hamas and Hezbollah threaten Israel with an extensive network of sophisticated tunnels which are used to smuggle weapons and carry out kidnappings and attacks against Israeli citizens.

These are not simple tunnels dug by hand with shovels. These tunnels cost millions of dollars and are built with thousands of tons of concrete. Often they are built using resources intended for humanitarian purposes in Gaza but are instead diverted to terrorist activity. They are constructed with machinery designed to avoid detection. In some cases, Hamas has filled the tunnels with provisions to last several months. The Israeli Defense Forces called the tunnels underneath Gaza an underground city of terror.

Bomb attacks from tunnels dug by terrorist organizations are a growing threat to forward deployed U.S. forces and our diplomatic personnel abroad. Terrorists carry out these attacks by digging tunnels underneath a target and detonating explosives.

Earlier this week, the publication Defense One reported that ISIS is also using tunnel bombs as a tactic, detonating at least 45 tunnel bombs in Iraq and Syria over the last 2 years.

We face threats from tunnels on American soil as well. Our own Border Patrol and law enforcement on the

southern border are up against drug smugglers, human traffickers, and other global criminal organizations using tunnels to sneak drugs, weapons, and people across our border illegally.

I serve on the Homeland Security Committee and understand the threat our Border Patrol agents and law enforcement face from transnational criminal organizations using tunnels along our southern border. These criminals flow to the path of least resistance, and as our border security efforts address one threat, they seek other methods to avoid detection and continue their criminal activity.

When the U.S. Border Patrol blocked drug smugglers and human traffickers from utilizing existing drainage tunnels, the criminals began digging their own tunnels. We need to stay ahead of these threats, and that is why we must conduct critical research and development so we can detect and destroy these dangerous tunnels.

This amendment will authorize joint research and development with Israel on anti-tunnel capabilities. This joint approach will help us work together on research and development against this shared threat.

The amendment requires Israel to share in the cost of this research and provides a framework for sharing intellectual property developed together before action is carried out. This amendment will allow the Department of Defense to work with Israel to develop a capability that will be used to protect our homeland and our troops abroad as well as those of our ally.

This amendment will make clear that joint research and development on anti-tunnel capabilities can and should be part of our security cooperation with Israel. It will also send a strong message that the Senate recognizes the threat posed by tunnels intended for attacks against Israel, and this cooperation will help us secure our own borders as well.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Ayotte-Peters amendment No. 1628. 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. MCCAIN. 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. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 1569, as modified, be withdrawn; that the next first-degree amendments in order to H.R. 1735, the Defense authorization bill, be the Gillibrand amendment No. 1578 and the Ernst amendment No. 1549; and that the Gillibrand and Ernst amendments be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1549 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I call up the Ernst amendment No. 1549.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for Mrs. ERNST, proposes an amendment numbered 1549 to amendment No. 1463.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for a temporary, emergency authorization of defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government)

At the end of section 1229, add the following:

(c) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to promote a stable and unified Iraq, including by directly providing the Kurdistan Regional Government military and security forces associated with the Government of Iraq with defense articles, defense services, and related training, on an emergency and temporary basis, to more effectively partner with the United States and other international coalition members to defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(d) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) MILITARY ASSISTANCE.—The President, in consultation with the Government of Iraq, is authorized to provide defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to Kurdistan Regional Government military and security forces associated with the Government of Iraq for the purpose of supporting international coalition efforts against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and any successor group or associated forces.

(2) DEFENSE EXPORTS.—The President is authorized to issue licenses authorizing United States exporters to export defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government military and security forces described in paragraph (1). For purposes of processing applications for such export licenses, the President is authorized to accept End Use Certificates approved by the Kurdistan Regional Government.

(3) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance authorized under paragraph (1) and exports authorized under paragraph (2) may include anti-tank and anti-armor weapons, armored vehicles, long-range artillery, crew-served weapons and ammunition, secure command and communications equipment, body armor, helmets, logistics equipment, excess defense articles and other military assistance that the President determines to be appropriate.

(e) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—

(1) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—Assistance authorized under subsection (b)(1) and licenses for exports authorized under subsection (d)(2) shall be provided pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), notwithstanding any requirement in such applicable provisions of law that a recipient of assistance of the type authorized under subsection (d)(1) shall be a country or international organization. In addition, any requirement in such provisions of law applicable to such countries or international organizations concerning the provision of end use retransfers and other assur-

ance required for transfers of such assistance should be secured from the Kurdistan Regional Government.

(2) CONSTRUCTION AS PRECEDENT.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as establishing a precedent for the future provision of assistance described in subsection (d) to organizations other than a country or international organization.

(f) REPORTS.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(A) A timeline for the provision of defense articles, defense services, and related training under the authority of subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2).

(B) A description of mechanisms and procedures for end-use monitoring of such defense articles, defense services, and related training.

(C) How such defense articles, defense services, and related training would contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States, as well as impact security in the region.

(2) UPDATES.—Not later than 180 days after the submittal of the report required by paragraph (1), and every 180 days thereafter through the termination pursuant to subsection (i) of the authority in subsection (d), the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report updating the previous report submitted under this subsection. In addition to any matters so updated, each report shall include a description of any delays, and the circumstances surrounding such delays, in the delivery of defense articles, defense services, and related training to the Kurdistan Regional Government pursuant to the authority in subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2).

(3) FORM.—Any report under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(4) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(g) NOTIFICATION.—The President should provide notification to the Government of Iraq, when practicable, not later than 15 days before providing defense articles, defense services, or related training to the Kurdistan Regional Government under the authority of subsection (d)(1) or (d)(2).

(h) ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “defense article”, “defense service”, and “training” have the meanings given those terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

(i) TERMINATION.—The authority to provide defense articles, defense services, and related training under subsection (d)(1) and the authority to issue licenses for exports authorized under subsection (d)(2) shall terminate on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1578 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

(Purpose: To reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Mr. REED. I ask that the pending amendment be set aside and on behalf of Senator GILLIBRAND I call up amendment No. 1578.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for Mrs. GILLIBRAND, proposes an amendment numbered 1578 to amendment to 1463.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of June 3, 2015, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, as is obvious, we have an agreement to votes on both the Gillibrand and Ernst amendments. I would imagine it may require a recorded vote, but I am not positive. Then, we are planning on moving forward with additional amendments as agreed to by both sides and a managers' package as well. That is our intention. I am told that at some point there may be a cloture motion on the bill as well.

So I wish to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his continued cooperation, and hopefully we can get as many Members' amendments as possible up and voted on and finish the bill, at the soonest, next week.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I await the impressive and loquacious and convincing words of the Senator from Texas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Arizona, but if I am going to be as loquacious as he suggested, it may take me a little more than 10 minutes, so I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last few days, this Chamber has been discussing the Defense authorization

bill, thus fulfilling one of our basic responsibilities as part of the Federal Government; that is, our national security, and in the process making sure our warfighters—the people who are on the cutting edge of the knife, so to speak, in terms of our national security—have the resources we are morally committed and duty-bound to provide them.

So when voting for the Defense authorization bill, we as legislators are fulfilling our responsibilities, just as those who wear the uniform are performing their duties—no more, no less—although I must say ours is a tad safer than they are experiencing, to be sure.

With so much at stake for the security of our country, the well-being of our folks in uniform as well as the families of those servicemembers hanging in the balance, as I mentioned yesterday, it is particularly disappointing that the Democratic leader has characterized the discussion of this bill as "a waste of time." I really have to believe he would want to take those words back because it certainly is not a waste of time.

Unfortunately, it is becoming more and more evident that the threats of the Democratic leader and the President of the United States to stall Republicans' efforts to get this bill passed quickly is just the first step to a larger political strategy. The reason I know that is not because it just occurred to me—an epiphany—it is because they said so in the pages of the Washington Post just yesterday.

The headline says it all: "Democrats prepare for filibuster summer." That is the headline in the Washington Post yesterday.

The article goes on to say: "Democrats have decided to block all spending bills starting with the defense appropriations measure headed to the floor next week."

So imagine my surprise when yesterday the Democratic leader came to the floor and accused Republicans of threatening to shut down the government, the same day his colleague, the senior Senator from New York, detailed their strategy to block all appropriations bills, in the Washington Post.

One thing we have to love about our friends across the aisle: They are not unclear, nor are they timid, about telling us what their plans are. Indeed, it is there for the world to read and for us to read.

But let me say it again. Hours after the Democratic leader laid out their plans to filibuster all government spending bills, their leader claimed Republicans were the ones threatening a shutdown.

This type of cynical political maneuvering is what the American people so soundly rejected in the last election on November 4. Stifling debate and shutting down the Senate are not what the American people sent us to do, and it is certainly not what my constituents expect me to do on their behalf.

Today, our colleagues across the aisle have now blocked an amendment that would provide for greater sharing of information to address the rampant and growing cyber threat this country faces. The sharing of cyber threat information will help us as a country deter future cyber attacks, and it helps both the public and the private sector to act in a more nimble way when attacks are detected. So the fact that seven Democrats joined virtually all Republicans to move forward with this bill, tells me the Democratic position is not monolithic. In other words, when the Democratic leader and the senior Senator from New York say it is our plan to shut down the Senate and not to cooperate to get the people's work done, not every Member of the Democratic minority are comfortable with that cynical strategy—and good for them.

The refusal to move forward with this legislation, particularly the cyber security part of this discussion, is just unconscionable.

Let me give my colleagues some other headlines. Just last week, there was a massive breach at the Office of Personnel Management. The sensitive personal information of up to 4 million—4 million—current and former Federal employees may have been compromised. There are now reports that the stolen data includes login information and credentials that is actively being traded, bought, and sold online.

Now, we will await the details of the current investigation into this, but we know it has great potential to harm not only the privacy interests and the financial interests of the people affected but also our national security. We know there are state actors—notably China and Russia—who are, on a regular basis, engaged in cyber attacks against the United States in an effort to steal our intellectual property as well as in order to do intelligence operations using the Internet and using cyber space.

Now, in terms of the personal interests of these employees, it may expose them—many of whom may work with national security matters—to further targeting by hackers, identity thieves, and even foreign intelligence agents.

At the end of last month, it was reported that the data of more than 100,000 taxpayers was stolen at the IRS. Just so colleagues understand the reason for my concern, the former Acting Director of the CIA, on June 11, 2015, when asked about former Senator and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's decision to put all of her official emails at the Secretary of State's office on a private email server, Michael Morell said: "I think that foreign intelligence services, the good ones, have everything on any unclassified network that the government uses."

So not only do they have it on unclassified networks such as the one Hillary Clinton maintained, but also if they are able to breach the security measures we have in place on government networks, they are happy to steal

that for whatever their purpose may be, whether it is intelligence-gathering or whether it is economic harm that they can impose on American citizens by hacking their identity or stealing their bank accounts or what have you.

So we also have to be worried about the 100,000 people whose accounts were hacked at the IRS. The suggestion that was made by the IRS Commissioner at the Finance Committee recently is that these identity thieves steal this information so they can then file false tax returns and then claim the refunds or the other credit that those taxpayers would have otherwise been able to receive. Imagine when these 100,000 or so taxpayers go about the business of filing their own tax returns, only to find out that a cyber thief has stolen their identity and filed a tax return and taken their refund or their tax credit before they ever had a chance to do it.

At the IRS, we know the breach included access to past tax returns. As we all know, we have to put a lot of sensitive information on tax returns. That is why they are not public information. But they also include sensitive information such as Social Security numbers, addresses, birth dates—all stolen and potentially in the hands of criminals.

The hypocrisy of the administration in this area is just breathtaking. It was just June 6—last Saturday—that Josh Earnest, the White House Press Secretary, chastised Congress, on behalf of the President of the United States, for not acting urgently enough on the issue of cyber security. Here is what Mr. Earnest said: “We need the United States Congress to come out of the Dark Ages and actually join us here in the 21st century to make sure that we have the kinds of defenses that are necessary to protect a modern computer system.”

That is what White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest said on June 6, 2015.

Then our colleagues on the Democratic side have the temerity to come here and block the very type of legislation that the White House has called for. How hypocritical can you get? How cynical can you get? Indeed, the Democratic leader then says, well, they are doing everything the way they should be doing it, and it is really a Republican conspiracy to shut down the government.

These are just the most recent examples of a threat that should be keeping us up at night—a threat that should cause us to quickly act to find solutions to the cyber security threat to the American people and to the United States Government and, yes, to our national security.

Some of our Democratic friends act as if the fact that we have decided to file an amendment to the Defense authorization bill, which represents an almost unanimous vote of the bipartisan vote of the Senate Intelligence Committee, was some sort of dirty

trick—that we pulled a fast one on them. Well, this legislation has been out there for the world to see for quite a while now, and it was negotiated by the senior Senator from California, the ranking member on the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator FEINSTEIN, and Senator BURR, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, and as I said, it only had one dissenting vote in the Senate Intelligence Committee. So to have the gall to come on the Senate floor and act as if this is some sort of pulling a fast one or some sort of trick is just disingenuous. I could probably think of some other words to describe it, too, but “disingenuous” will have to suffice for now.

To come out here and to block debate on a vote on a cyber security bill at a time when the news is chock-full of the nature of this threat and its intrusive invasion into the privacy of the American people and its danger to our national security is just flat out irresponsible. These are not threats we can afford to ignore.

And here is the coup de grace—the icing on the cake. Two months ago the Democratic leader came to the floor and said he was “committed” to getting cyber security legislation done, and that was before these most recent attacks. So for the Democratic leader to claim this morning that Senate Republicans were—these are his words—using “deceitful ploys” to ensure our Nation is safe from these threats is really beyond the pale.

In addition to the clear and undeniable urgency of the problem, I would like to also point out that this was the same language that was, as I said, passed out of the Intelligence Committee in March. So perhaps you can understand why I am so confused by our Democratic colleagues’ position and actually by the White House’s position.

The White House called for cyber security legislation. Cyber security legislation gets voted out of the Senate Intelligence Committee 14 to 1. The Democratic leader said we need to act on cyber security, and we try to act on cyber security legislation, only to be blocked by the Democratic leader. All I can see is the Democratic leader’s “commitment” to work on cyber legislation has given way to partisan gamesmanship by our Democratic colleagues who are promising “a filibuster summer.” Well, welcome to the filibuster summer.

But this is not what the American people deserve. This isn’t why they sent us here, and this is what they affirmatively rejected this last election. But somehow our Democratic colleagues just can’t stand it that we have actually turned things around and we have been able to make some slow, incremental progress. We passed the first budget since 2009. You know, that should be a scandal, but I guess it represents progress that we finally have been able to do it with the new majority starting in January. We have

worked with the White House to pass trade promotion authority and some things that are tough and are controversial on both sides of the aisle. We have taken a number of positive steps on child trafficking and on a number of other topics. Now we are trying to do our most basic duty and deal with our Nation’s defense, and that includes protecting our Nation’s cyber security infrastructure while we fund our Armed Forces to make sure they have the resources to do what they volunteered to do so bravely on our behalf.

The men and women of this country and particularly the men and women who wear the uniform of the U.S. military deserve better. This National Defense Authorization Act, this basic bill to which the cyber security language was being offered, has strong bipartisan support, and it passed out of the Armed Services Committee overwhelmingly. And do you know what? It even authorizes funding levels at the figure requested by the President of the United States. Yet our Senate Democratic colleagues are still dragging their feet, refusing to allow us to vote on amendments to this bill and defeating the very cyber security provision that the Democratic leader said we ought to get to and that Josh Earnest chastised Congress for not passing. Yet Members of his own political party—the President’s own political party—blocked that cyber security legislation.

So this bill should not be held hostage to political gamesmanship. The American people’s security and safety should not be held hostage to political gamesmanship, and the Senate, which used to be known as the world’s greatest deliberative body, should not be used just purely for partisan gain.

So I hope that the seven Democrats who actually voted to proceed on this cyber security bill will get some more allies. I can tell that not all of our friends across the aisle are comfortable with the Democratic leader’s direction to block this cyber security legislation, and perhaps over the weekend, some will have second thoughts. I hope as they have those second thoughts, they will focus on our collective duty to our troops and their families and to our duty as Members of the Senate to promote and protect the security of the American people.

So let’s get back to basics. Let’s do what the American people elected us to do by voting on a bipartisan bill that will protect our country and provide for our troops.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FERGUSON EFFECT

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, last month I was here on the Senate floor

to address the topic of the riots in Baltimore and the unfortunate and completely misguided scapegoating of police officers that has been going on far too often in parts of our country today. So I rise again today on the same topic because in just the last month or so there have been some more very harmful developments in this area.

One of those developments is the dramatic decline in police arrests and a massive increase in violent crime and murders in the city of Baltimore. Now, some of my friends would say: Why is the Senator from Pennsylvania speaking out so often about these tragic circumstances that are happening in Baltimore? Well, first of all, as a U.S. Senator, I am concerned with what goes on in our entire country, not just my State. Baltimore is a great American city that is going through a very difficult period, and we should all be concerned about it. Second of all, Baltimore is, of course, less than 100 miles away from Pennsylvania. Most importantly, what is happening in Baltimore is not happening only in Baltimore. The scapegoating of police and the rise of violent crime is happening in New York City and in other places as well. And, frankly, it is a threat to public safety and security in every city.

Some, including the police chief of St. Louis, MO, have described what has come to be known as the Ferguson effect. This can be traced back to the riots and lawlessness that followed the unfortunate death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, MO, last August. As you will remember, in the Ferguson case, Officer Darren Wilson acted in self-defense and shot and killed Brown when Brown attacked him while he was resisting arrest. In the weeks and months that followed the incident, and after Officer Wilson was cleared of wrongdoing, violent protests erupted. Protesters, police, and bystanders were injured. Buildings were burned to the ground. Property was destroyed. But instead of placing the onus on those who were actually causing the havoc, it was portrayed by many as if law enforcement was somehow responsible for the violence and unrest. Anti-law enforcement sentiments were even expressed by some of the local officials in Ferguson. This endorsement of violent protesters empowered those who wished to turn peaceful protests into violent riots, and it also left the police feeling powerless.

What has happened in Ferguson since is as tragic as it was predictable. The homicide rate in Ferguson increased 47 percent in the latter portion of 2014, and robberies in St. Louis County jumped by 82 percent. This really should be no surprise. This is what happens when a city puts these views of "police as the problem" into practice, such as when a city determines that police are the cause of the violence as opposed to the brave defense against it, when a city justifies lawlessness, stops law enforcement from doing its job, and allows law breakers to go unpunished. The results of those prac-

tices are that the innocent members of those very communities pay a horrible price.

These tragic circumstances are now playing out in the city of Baltimore. On April 18 of this year, many Baltimore residents began peaceful protests over the injury and eventual death of Mr. Freddie Gray while he was in police custody. As I mentioned in my speech about this last month, in my view, Freddie Gray's death absolutely calls out for justice and calls out for a thorough investigation, and the judicial process is now proceeding and playing out exactly as it should. But what has happened in Baltimore since then is not about Freddie Gray.

A week after the Baltimore protests began, on April 25, they turned violent. Over the next 5 days rioters damaged 200 businesses. They set fire to a newly constructed senior center, burned down a CVS drugstore and cut the fire hose of the firemen who were trying to put out the flames, and set fire to 144 cars. And 130 law enforcement officers were injured, many seriously. The chaos was so extreme that the city had to impose a curfew for 5 days and had to call in 3,000 National Guard troops.

Now with all that mayhem, how did the public officials of Baltimore respond? On the first day of the violence, the mayor held a press conference in which she legitimized the violence. She said: "We also gave those who wish to destroy space to do that as well."

Seriously, space to destroy? Destroying other people's property, setting buildings and cars ablaze, attacking police officers? These are not legitimate acts, and no mayor should be accommodating those kinds of acts with "space." In fact, they are criminal. They are harmful. These are exactly the kinds of activities that a mayor should be all about stopping and preventing. But that is not all.

Next the Baltimore police were given a stand-down order, and they were forbidden from arresting the looters and the rioters. Then officials announced that half of all those arrested for the destruction and violence would be released without charges. Mobs would gather around police when they tried to enforce the law. All this is a clear illustration of the impact that the Ferguson effect is having on Baltimore.

Lawbreakers are in control, and the city's residents are at the mercy of the lawbreakers. Law enforcement has been limited because of a lack of support from the community and the civic and the political leaders.

Baltimore has seen the disastrous effects of this policy. The riots began to subside on April 30 when six police officers were arrested in the death of Mr. Gray, but the violence has continued. The month of May that just passed was Baltimore's deadliest month in over 40 years. There were 43 homicides in the month of May alone. Shootings have more than doubled compared to May of the previous year. These murders have nothing to do with anger over the

death of Freddie Gray; they have everything to do with public policy that disparages police and turns a blind eye on criminal activity. You see, in Baltimore in the month of May, arrests were nearly 70 percent lower than the same month last year.

Some attempt to portray this whole crisis in racial terms, but tragically all too often the victims of this surge in violent crime are innocent African Americans who live in cities in which the police are no longer permitted to do their jobs.

Consider the case of an 8-year-old boy police found shot in the head on Thursday, May 28 at 8:20 a.m. He was lying dead beside his mother, who had also been fatally shot in the head.

Take the case of 23-year-old Charles Dobbins, who was killed on Monday, May 25. Charles' cousin reports that Charles was killed in a robbery. Charles worked at BWI. He worked transporting handicapped people to and from the terminals. He loved kids. When he graduated from high school, he worked for Baltimore city schools as a bus aid assisting disabled children.

Consider the case of 4-year-old Jacele Johnson. She was in a car with her teenage cousin when someone opened fire on the car, seriously wounding them both.

These are not just statistics; these are real people who are now lost to us. Their lives matter. That 8-year-old boy and his mother, 23-year-old Charles Dobbins, a little 4-year-old girl, Jacele Johnson, and her cousin—their lives matter.

The Ferguson effect, unfortunately, is not the only phenomenon that is at work here. Unfortunately, our President seems to have bought into the notion that the police are the problem and the solution is to deny them valuable tools.

This last month, the President announced extensive restrictions on when local police may access lifesaving Federal surplus equipment. The gear we are talking about is almost all purely defensive. It is riot helmets, riot shields, armored personnel transport vehicles. This is surplus gear. The Federal Government has already paid for it but has decided it has no use for it. It has long been the practice that this surplus protective gear has been made available to local police forces.

Why is this administration making it harder to send this purely defensive gear—gear that would otherwise go unused—to insufficiently protected police officers across the country? Why would the administration do that? Well, they released a report telling us why. Here is what they said in their own report. According to this report by the administration, the Federal equipment "could significantly undermine community trust" and that this concern outweighs the interest in "addressing law enforcement needs (that could not otherwise be fulfilled)." President Obama likewise opined that Federal equipment "can sometimes give people

a feeling like there's an occupying force" and "can send the wrong message."

So this is the concern that justified keeping lifesaving gear from police officers. So, according to the administration, the need to save police officers' lives in the line of duty is something that should be weighed against and, in fact, sacrificed to the desire to prevent distrust or discomfort on the part of others. How many police officers' lives are we going to sacrifice? One? Twenty? One-hundred? This is outrageous.

Each day across America, there are 780,000 law enforcement officers who put on a badge and uniform, and they answer the call of those in need no matter the danger. When others run away, they run to the problem. The rest of us in America rely on these law enforcement officers doing their job. The people who live in high-crime areas, often ethnic minorities living in high-poverty areas of our inner cities—these are the folks who most depend on those officers. When those officers are held back, we all pay a steep price, but the residents of those communities pay the steepest price.

I just hope we in the Federal Government will stop putting obstacles in the way of law enforcement and start supporting them. I hope we as a nation will stop scapegoating law enforcement and start thanking them. If we fail to reverse the Ferguson effect, what we will see is more violent crime and more suffering of our people.

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. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIPARTISANSHIP

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, over the past few years, bipartisanship has not always fared well in the Senate. We have been able to change the Chamber's culture for the better in 2015. Now that is in jeopardy once again.

In the first half of the year, we had a number of bipartisan accomplishments. It kicked off with the passage of the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act at the beginning of the year. The new law will provide the VA with the personnel, services, and proper tools to help veterans facing mental illness struggles, which is vital as it is estimated that 22 veterans commit suicide every day. The Clay Hunt act will help stop this tragic and unacceptable trend.

Then we were able to pass the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act in a unanimous fashion. This law will save lives. It will restore dignity to the victims of these heinous crimes, and it will help end modern-day slavery.

We followed that with legislation that will give Congress a voice in the President's negotiations with Iran over its illicit nuclear program. There was such a strong show of bipartisanship on this vote that it forced President Obama to drop his initial veto threat. Had we not maintained bipartisan unity, there would be no review of the Iran deal. There would be nothing stopping President Obama from signing a bad agreement with Iran. It is because we stood together across party lines that the American people will now have a say in negotiations.

Before we adjourned for the Memorial Day work period, we approved granting the President trade promotion authority. We worked together to provide the President with the necessary tools to negotiate a fair trade deal while maintaining Congress's important role in the process.

I say all this to highlight what we can accomplish when we work together. Unfortunately, the minority leader seems intent on ending that streak.

We are in the midst of discussing another bill which should have substantial bipartisan support, the National Defense Authorization Act. Yet, Minority Leader REID has called this vital, traditionally bipartisan bill "a waste of time." This is a bill which, as the senior Senator from Arizona has noted, Congress has passed for 53 consecutive years, including those when the minority leader controlled the Senate schedule.

Far from a waste of time, the NDAA helps us modernize our military to face today's security challenges. We live in a dangerous world. We have to stay ahead of those who would seek to harm us, not fall behind them. This is no time to be dismissive of our national security needs.

It is also about the livelihood of over 1.4 million men and women on Active Duty and 718,000 civilian personnel. We are talking about the Nation's largest employer. The NDAA helps us ensure that we are doing everything we need to do to help them. So I think we can all agree there is much in this bill that needs to get done.

Unfortunately, the White House is taking what should be a bipartisan bill and using it to push for its own political end game to increase domestic spending. Worse yet, the President has somehow convinced Senate Democrats to go along with this misguided strategy.

Instead of approaching this in a bipartisan manner, the minority leader is forcing his caucus to carry water for President Obama, who has indicated he would veto the NDAA unless he gets the domestic spending increases he is demanding. That means the President stands ready to block the policy prescriptions and funding levels for the Department of Defense unless we give other agencies, such as the EPA, as they try their additional power grab through things like the Clean Water

Act and extending that, and the IRS, as they waste money on bonuses for their employees—all of this is very dangerous.

There will be plenty of time to debate our domestic spending priorities and allotments, but now is not the time. Let's get that bipartisan mentality back and finish the work that needs to be done to protect our Nation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, today, as I have for a number of weeks, I rise to speak about 11 North Dakotans who did not come home from the Vietnam war. Each of these men gave his life for our country.

Before I begin speaking about the 198 North Dakotans who died during Vietnam, I wish to thank my great friend, Bill Anderson of Rutland, ND. Bill is a marine, and he is a veteran of the Vietnam war.

Bill grew up in Rutland, attended the University of North Dakota, and then started law school at the University of Colorado. It was the late 1960s, and young men with college degrees were being drafted. So Bill left law school, enlisted in the Marine Corps, and was trained to be an officer. In 1970, he arrived in Vietnam and became the commander of the 2nd Platoon of Delta Company, 1st Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment.

Bill's own written words about the impact the Vietnam war had on him strike me. He didn't choose to write about his blindness caused by the malaria vaccine that he took or his lymphoma caused by Agent Orange exposure. Instead, Bill focused on his experience in Vietnam and on the greatness of the 18- and 20-year-old Marines with whom he served. Bill writes:

I am proud, every day, of the Marines I served with in Vietnam. They did not shrink from danger. They did not flinch at combat. They did their duty with steadfast courage of United States Marines, and for that Americans can, and should, be proud and grateful.

I am grateful for Bill's service to our country. I am also proud of his service to my State. After his time in the Marines, Bill ran his family-owned insurance business. And then, when he was 40 years old and had lost most of his vision, he returned to law school. Since the 1980s, Bill has served many communities in southeastern North Dakota as a private practice lawyer. In fact, I can tell you this, as a lawyer myself: Bill Anderson is one of the most brilliant

lawyers I have ever worked with. And since 2004, Bill has been a Sargent County Commissioner.

So thank you, Bill. I hope that you will have a great reunion later this month in Tennessee with the Marines of Company D.

Mr. President, I now wish to take a few moments to talk about the lives of those Vietnam veterans who did not come home.

ARLAN GABLE

Arlan Gable was from Rolette. He was born February 3, 1938. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. Arlan was 29 years old when he died on June 10, 1967.

He was the youngest of 10 children and grew up on his parents' farm outside of Rolette. Arlan's niece, Sandi, remembers all the animals on the farm, and in particular, she remembers chasing his mother's geese.

Each of the five boys in the family served our country in the military. Right after graduating from high school, Arlan enlisted in the Army. He served in Korea and Germany, and he served two tours of duty in Vietnam. Arlan was killed while serving as the gunner on a tank when the tank hit a landmine. About 1 month before, Arlan had been home on leave. After his death, Arlan's mother's health deteriorated very rapidly.

MARK MANGIN

Mark Mangin, a native of Verono, was born April 29, 1949. He served in the Marine Corps' 3rd Marine Amphibious Force. On October 1, 1969, Mark died. He was only 20 years old.

He grew up on his parents' small farm and had one brother, Marvin. Marvin said that during high school Mark played basketball and loved fixing old cars. The brothers both worked for neighboring farmers. Before graduating, Mark enlisted to serve because he wanted to become a marine. He earned his GED while at basic training.

Mark sent letters home from Vietnam asking Marvin to take care of their mom and dad, and he wrote that he was an expert marksman and liked what he was doing. He included pictures of himself holding young Vietnamese children.

When he had less than 1 month left of his tour of duty in Vietnam, Mark was killed when someone near him tripped the wire of a boobytrap. His brother believes that with his mechanical abilities, he would have become a mechanic.

MICHAEL MEYHOFF

Michael Meyhoff was from Center and was born February 3, 1948. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. Michael died January 4, 1968. He was 19 years old.

He grew up in a big family in a small house. Michael was the second of 11 children. Two of his brothers, Rick and Brent, also served in the Army.

While growing up, Michael enjoyed helping his grandparents on their family farm near Center, ND. Michael's

brother, Rick, says that Michael was a good athlete and was an explorer. He always had to see what was over the next hill. He especially loved fishing with his father and always looked forward to fishing trips as opportunities to explore and spend time with his family in the outdoors. Michael was very family-minded and was excellent at writing letters and responding to letters from his brothers, sisters, parents, and grandparents.

When he died, Michael's community was deeply affected. Now, 47 years after his death, his family and community still think about him or talk about him daily.

Michael's mother, Harriet, will turn 90 years old next month. She has told the family that when she dies, she wants to be buried with Michael's Purple Heart.

CHARLES PIPER, JR.

Charles Piper, Jr., was born November 21, 1937. He was from Durbin. He served in the Navy on the USS Robison as a master chief boiler technician. Charles was 34 years old when he died on August 30, 1972.

Charles and his sister Marion worked on nearby farms after their father died when they were children. Marion says that Charles was a good listener and was always a good mentor to her son. When Charles was 17 years old and had just graduated from Casselton High School, he enlisted in the Navy. He didn't like water, but his cousins serving in the Navy inspired him to join.

Charles made his Navy service a career. He had about a year left in the Navy before he planned to retire. His dream after retirement was to work for the game and fish department and to live with his wife Marie on their farm near Kalispell, MT.

THOMAS WELKER

Thomas Welker was born on February 23, 1938, and made his home in Minot with his wife Frances. He served in the Army 101st Airborne Division. His unit was called the Screaming Eagles. Thomas died on July 27, 1967. He was 29 years old.

Before going to Vietnam, the Army stationed Thomas, Frances, and their sons, John, Thomas, Rodney, and Dean, in several places in the United States. Thomas' older stepson, Rodney, said that Thomas loved to hunt and fish. He worked two jobs to support his family, working as a bartender on the base in the evenings.

In Vietnam, Thomas was killed when someone nearby stepped on a Bouncing Betty. The Army awarded him a Bronze Star Medal for his valor that day. Thomas is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

IRVIN KNIPPELBERG

Irvin Knippelberg was born in Turtle Lake on January 17, 1939. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. He was 27 years old when he died on May 19, 1966.

He was the youngest of five children. His two brothers served our country

during the Korean war—Jack in the Army and Darold in the Navy.

Growing up on his family's farm near Turtle Lake, Irvin was the big little brother. He was 6 feet 4 inches tall, but he was the kid brother. His brother Darold is Irvin's only living sibling. Darold said that when the brothers played together boxing, Irvin's arms were so long that he could hit his brothers four times before they could ever get close to him. Darold remembers Irvin as a good-natured, loveable guy who everyone liked. Darold says he knows that Irvin's faith helped him along in life.

After high school, Irvin first enlisted in the Marine Corps. He later enlisted in the Army and spent time in Alaska and Japan before his tour of duty in Vietnam. He planned to make the Army his career. Irvin had only been in Vietnam about 1 month when he was shot and killed.

DELBERT AUSTIN OLSON

Delbert Austin Olson was from Casselton, and he was born on January 4, 1926. He served as a commander in the Navy. Delbert was 42 years old when he went missing on January 11, 1968.

Delbert was the youngest of four children who grew up on his family's farm. His brothers also served in the military—Charles in Korea and Harold in World War II. Delbert's family said that he loved flying and was committed to his Navy career. He was a phenomenal naval officer and pilot.

Delbert was 6 feet 4 inches tall, and his son, David, is 6 feet 6 inches tall. Delbert's brother, Charles, told David that he looks just like his dad, "Delly."

In 1968, Delbert and eight other Navy crewmen went missing when their aircraft crashed into a mountain in Laos. In the 1990s, investigation crews were finally able to search for the remains from the crash. All nine crewmen were identified and, in 2003, they were buried together in Arlington National Cemetery.

In addition to his siblings, Delbert is survived by his daughter Dana and his son David.

DONALD SOBY

Donald Soby was from Rugby. He was born on December 15, 1946. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division. Donald died on July 7, 1967. He was 20 years old.

Donald was the youngest of three children. His brother William also served in Vietnam in the Air Force.

Their sister Margaret said that Donald always lived for today. He was a good kid, but if he wanted to do something, he would go and do it that day because he may not get another chance. She remembers Donald's sense of humor and good-natured pranks.

Donald and his best friend, Terry, shared many adventures together, including taking Margaret's young son with them to a nearby town to attract girls and running into the game warden, who sent them home after discovering the ducks they were supposed to

be hunting looked a lot more like pheasants.

Donald and his brother William both served in Vietnam at the same time. The brothers inquired about Donald's leaving Vietnam since they were both serving, but they were advised to wait until William's discharge. They were able to spend Christmas of 1966 together. That was the last time William saw Donald.

In May, Donald was wounded, and he died in July as a result of those wounds. The family is extremely grateful to Wanda Nielson of Rugby for coordinating efforts for the military to fly Donald's mother to the Philippines to be with Donald at the time of his death.

JOHN JOYCE

John Joyce, a Minot native, was born on November 15, 1944. He served in the Marine Corps, Kilo Company, 3rd Battalion, 26th Marines. John died on April 17, 1969. He was 24 years old.

John was one of four children and enjoyed playing sports in his free time. In addition to playing football, basketball, and track, John left a legacy of being an excellent baseball player. He played baseball for Minot State University and for Northern Arizona University. In 2001, he was inducted into the Minot Baseball Hall of Fame.

After college John became a teacher and coach for a year in Montana. He then enlisted in the Marines and served in Vietnam. One of John's best friends, Jan Olson, who taught with John and also served in Vietnam, said this about John: "Inch for inch, pound for pound, he was the toughest man I ever knew and he was also the nicest man."

About 6 weeks after his death, John was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for his heroic actions. His Bronze Star citation describes John putting himself in the line of fire while defending his platoon with a grenade launcher and then carrying a wounded companion to a covered position.

Ronald Jensen is a Marine who served under John in Vietnam. Ronald's 2003 book, titled "Tail End Charlie," describes John like this:

He was a great guy, no questions about it. He helped everybody, always in the front, and he saved me. He was most liked by his men. He saved a lot of lives over there.

WILLIAM "BILL" KRISTJANSON

William "Bill" Kristjanson was born October 13, 1943, and was from Inkster. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. His unit's nickname was the Black Scarves. Bill died on February 26, 1970. He was 26 years old. He was the only child born to Sig and Frances Kristjanson.

He attended elementary school in Conway and high school in Inkster. In 1967, Bill graduated from the University of North Dakota. He also attended the University of Michigan and the University of Oslo in Norway. Bill's pride and interest in his father's Icelandic heritage inspired him to tour Iceland after graduating from UND.

In 1968, Bill was drafted into the Army. In Vietnam, he was involved in

both ground and air combat. About 5 months after arriving in Vietnam, Bill was promoted from private first class to sergeant on the battlefield.

On February 11, Bill was injured when the vehicle he was riding in overturned. About 2 weeks later, he died in a military hospital in Japan. The ten medals the Army awarded him, both before and after his death, demonstrate that Bill was a heroic soldier the Army valued greatly.

PATRICK MCCABE

Patrick McCabe was from Bismarck, and he was born on July 20, 1924. He served in the Army as a master sergeant. Patrick died May 6, 1968, at the age of 43.

He came from a family dedicated to serving our country. Four of the six boys in his family served in the military, and all three of Patrick's sons followed in his footsteps and joined the military. Two of his sons served in Vietnam after Patrick's death—Mark as a medic in the Marines and Scott as an Air Force pilot. Patrick's third son, David, served in the Air Force for over 20 years.

Patrick's daughter, Kathy, said that her dad was a good man who helped anyone who needed it. Her dad loved his country and felt like the Army was his family.

Patrick served in World War II and two tours of duty in Vietnam. He volunteered to return to Vietnam and died during his second tour of duty.

We tell these stories because we cannot ever forget that every life matters. I am always struck by imagining what these young men would have been had they been allowed to grow up, whom these young men could have been when they were grandfathers and whom they would have taken fishing or hunting or taught how to play football. But these lives were given in sacrifice to their country and in sacrifice so that all of us can live in freedom, and we must never forget, during this period of commemoration of the Vietnam war, those people who gave the ultimate sacrifice, those people who were killed in action in Vietnam.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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 Senator from Alaska.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the National Defense Authorization Act. I rise in support to move this bill forward and the amendments that many of us in this body want to have heard, debated, and voted on.

I also rise in opposition to obstruction—obstruction to this bill, obstruction to the key issues of national defense for our country. Make no mistake, there is obstruction going on, on the Senate floor right now, with regard to this important bill.

A little bit of background here: This bill, the NDAA, came out of the Senate Armed Services Committee after a lot of hard work, bipartisan work, by all the members of the committee. We worked together to include over 185 amendments. Almost all of these were bipartisan amendments.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle talked about voting against the bill because they did not like the way it was funded, even though our committee had nothing to do with the funding. But at the end of the day, after much debate in the committee, we worked and passed a strong, important, reform-oriented bipartisan NDAA by a vote of 22 to 4. That is bipartisan.

I thank the chairman of that committee Senator MCCAIN and the ranking member Senator REED on their great leadership in getting this committee to work so closely together to move the bill forward.

As part of the Armed Services Committee, just 2 weeks ago, I had the distinct honor of traveling with both of them to Vietnam and to Singapore for an important Defense Ministry conference. It was a huge honor for me as a new Member of the body to travel with JOHN MCCAIN and JACK REED—two veterans who have sacrificed a lot for their country—to Vietnam and other places. They did a fantastic job on this bill.

Then, this bill came to the floor and it all stopped. Everything came to a halt. There are over 500 amendments of Senators who want to move forward on a bipartisan basis to try to improve this bill. We have gotten to barely a trickle—barely a trickle—and nothing has happened. For 2 weeks we have been on this bill and nothing has happened after the great work we did in the Senate Armed Services Committee.

What is going on here? It is the same obstructionist playbook that my colleagues and particularly the minority leader used for the last few years, and the American people have rejected it. They rejected it last November, and they rejected it when they realized this body had only 14 rollcall votes on amendments during the entire year of 2014. That is not how this body is supposed to work. Nobody on either side of the aisle wants this body to work that way. It is certainly not how it is supposed to work when it comes to the defense of our Nation and the critical bill to take care of our men and women in uniform. Yet, the minority leader said this bill is a waste of time. I will repeat that. The National Defense Authorization Act, one of the most important things we do in this body, is "a waste of time."

I understand that the parties have ideological differences, and that is certainly the way it should be. That is the

way it has been since the founding of our great Nation. But if leaders on the other side of the aisle believe that protecting the country, taking care of the men and women in uniform, and keeping our promises to them is a waste of time, then we don't belong to different parties, we belong in different universes. In this world, in this universe, in the U.S. Senate, our most important job is to protect this country and to take care of the men and women who so courageously serve our country. It is not a waste of time to be doing that. It is the most important thing we were sent here to do.

We took an oath. We pledged to solemnly swear to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. That is what this bill does, and that is what we—Members on both sides—are trying to do in terms of improving it with amendments, but none of those are moving. None of those are moving, and that is a shame.

One of the things we tried to address in the bill is the serious threats and challenges our Nation faces.

At the Senate Armed Services Committee hearing we had several weeks ago, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said:

The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the second world war.

We know what they are—the growth and brutality of ISIS, a rising China, Iran on the verge of obtaining a nuclear weapon. The largest state sponsor of terrorism is possibly on the verge of gaining a nuclear weapon, and a resurgent Russia has invaded the sovereign territory of another country. It is the first time since World War II in the heart of Europe.

So at this time we not only have obstruction on the other side of the aisle from the leader there, the President of the United States is threatening to veto the NDAA. I am not sure they are reading about what is going on in the world. I am not sure they recognize the critical importance of this bill. And to threaten to veto this bill, and therefore what—we are going to stop? No. We are going to do our duty, and we will put this on the President's desk, and we will see if he vetoes it when the United States faces this huge array of challenges.

Let me talk about one of those challenges for a few minutes. It is an important area. As a Senator from Alaska, it is certainly an important area for me. It is the Arctic and the increasing militarization of the Arctic by Russia.

Earlier this year, Russia began a 5-day Arctic war exercise that included 38,000 troops, 50 surface warships, in addition to submarines, and 110 aircraft in the Arctic. And the Russians are not being shy about their ambitions in the Arctic. President Putin has said he wants to build 13 new airfields and add four new Russian combat brigades in the Arctic. He is going to stand up a

new Arctic command, and he is going to add several new icebreakers to their already robust fleet.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee talked about this. He talked about what the Russians are doing in the Arctic. There is no mystery here. As a matter of fact, today there was an outstanding article in the Wall Street Journal entitled "The New Cold War's Arctic Front," with the subtitle "Putin is militarizing one of the world's coldest, most remote regions." Well, in my State, this is home. America is an Arctic nation because of Alaska.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The Wall Street Journal, Jun. 9, 2015]

THE NEW COLD WAR'S ARCTIC FRONT

(By Sohrab Ahmari)

HELSINKI.—G-7 leaders gathering in Bavaria on Monday vowed to extend sanctions if Russia doesn't dial back its aggression against Ukraine. Previous sanctions haven't deterred Kremlin land-grabs, and the question now isn't if Russian President Vladimir Putin will strike again but whom he'll target next. Mr. Putin considers Europe's eastern periphery, stretching from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea, part of Russia's imperial inheritance.

Yet in recent years the Russian leader has also turned his attention northward, to the Arctic, militarizing one of the world's coldest, most remote regions. Here in Finland, one of eight Arctic states, the Russian menace next door looms large.

"That is a tough nut to crack, to know exactly what the Russians want," newly appointed Finnish Foreign Minister Timo Soini says. "But I'm sure they know. Because they are masters of chess, and if something is on the loose they will take it"—a variation on the old proverb that "a Cossack will take whatever is not fixed to the ground."

There is much that "is not fixed to the ground" already in the Arctic, and more every year. Climate change is transforming the High North. By 2030, the Northern Sea Route (NSR) from the Kara Strait to the Pacific will have nine weeks of open water, according to the U.S. Navy, up from two in 2012. The NSR is a 35% to 60% shorter passage between European ports and East Asia than the Suez or Panama routes, according to the Arctic Council. The Northwest Passage, which connects the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans via the Canadian Arctic Archipelago, will have five weeks of open water by 2030, up from zero in 2012. It represents a 25% shorter passage between Rotterdam and Seattle than non-Arctic routes, according to a NATO Parliamentary Assembly study published in March. As with other claims about the climate, these aren't universally accepted prognostications.

These changes have implications not just for trade but also for the ability to exploit the vast energy resources beneath the Arctic. Energy fields in the region have to date produced some 40 billion barrels of oil and 1,100 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates the region also holds 13% of the world's undiscovered conventional oil, a third of the world's undiscovered conventional gas and a fifth of the world's undiscovered natural-gas liquids.

No wonder Moscow has been racing to reopen old Soviet bases on its territory across

the Arctic and develop new ones. Mr. Putin wants by the end of 2015 to have 14 operational airfields in the Arctic, according to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and he has increased Russia's special-forces presence in the region by 30%.

"In the Arctic area they have twofold objectives," says a senior official at the Finnish Defense Ministry. "To secure the Northern Sea Route and [exploit] the energy-resources potential. And they are increasing their ability to surveil that part of the world, to refurbish their abilities for the air force and the Northern Fleet. They are exercising their ability to move their airborne troops from the central part of Russia to the north."

The Russian buildup in the region is made worse by the fact that Moscow makes no effort to be a good neighbor. The Kremlin's propensity for holding unannounced exercises in the region can only be a deliberate attempt to provoke. The senior official voices the concern that the Kremlin might use yet another such drill "as deployment for a real operation"—which is considerably less paranoid than it sounds given Mr. Putin's record.

Russian warplanes have violated Finnish airspace as recently as August, and pro-Kremlin media have also launched a systematic propaganda campaign against Finland. "They are writing things about us and our defense forces that are not from this world," says the senior official, such as the yarn that the Finnish government removes children from ethnic-Russian Finnish families for adoption by gay couples in the U.S.

Another Defense Ministry official says that he finds it hard to view as spontaneous "one of their pro-Putin demonstrations with crowds shouting 'Thank you, Putin! You gave us Crimea. Now give us Poland and Finland.'"

Despite such developments, the possibility of conflict here might seem distant for now. But it poses troubling questions about the West's readiness in the Arctic-security race. So far there has been plenty of Allied strategizing, including a 2013 White House paper on Arctic strategy heavy on climate-change alarmism but offering little by way of real mobilization. Russia still has the world's largest fleet of icebreakers, many of them nuclear-powered. Washington, by contrast, fields just one heavy icebreaker, the Coast Guard's aging Polar Star.

For the Finns, the Kremlin menace raises another touchy issue: their nonmembership in NATO. The April election that sent Mr. Soini to the Foreign Ministry and the centrist Juha Sipilä into the premiership relegated Alexander Stubb, an uncommonly pro-NATO Finnish prime minister, to the Finance Ministry in the new government. Mr. Soini, who leads the right-wing populist True Finns party, has denounced Mr. Stubb in the past as a "radical market liberal NATO hawk." But now in government, Mr. Soini strikes more nuanced notes that belie his party's anti-Atlanticist reputation.

"If we think that the paradigm [in the region] is going to be changed," he says, "there is no hesitation that we will do it," meaning join NATO. He adds: "Whatever the system or situation in Russia we have to cope, and we have some experience with them. And they also respect us. They know our history. . . . We want to be independent and free."

Mr. SULLIVAN. The writer of this article talks about what is at stake and about what the Russians are doing in the Arctic.

Here is a map. It is a little small, but it shows Russia's Arctic push and the dramatic increase of airbases, operational infrastructure all around the

Arctic, and the different exercises. We know that it is an important place—transportation, natural resources. This is a critical area.

Our leaders are taking notice, our military leaders. ADM Bill Gortney with the U.S. Northern Command stated: “Russian heavy bombers flew more out-of-area patrols in 2014 than in any year since the Cold War.”

Secretary of Defense Carter just 2 months ago said: “The Arctic is going to be a major area of importance to the United States, both strategically and economically in the future—it’s fair to say that we’re late to the recognition of that.”

This is why the NDAA is so important. Congress heard this testimony. The Senate Armed Services Committee heard this testimony. We have been following what has been happening in the Arctic, and we have acted. The NDAA has provisions to start to address the challenges we see in the Arctic. It certainly is focused on making sure the Arctic remains a peaceful and stable place, but it also starts to focus the leadership of our military on the Arctic, and that is important.

There is language in the NDAA which was unanimously voted on in the committee—it is very bipartisan—that requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report that updates the U.S. military strategy in the Arctic and requires a military operations plan to be described for the protection and security of our interest in the Arctic. It lays out what the issues are, what the threats are, and what the Russians are doing in the Arctic.

President Putin is certainly going to be watching, and maybe he is taking notice that we are noticing, and that is one reason why this is an important bill.

As we can see here, today’s Wall Street Journal article talked about President Putin moving forward and possibly having the ability to send airborne troops and airborne brigades to the Arctic. Yet, right now, our own U.S. Army is thinking about removing the only airborne brigade in the Arctic. That is not good strategy.

That is why we need this bill. We need to set the direction in terms of strategy and to make sure we are not making strategic mistakes as the Russians move forward in the Arctic and we start looking at reducing our capabilities there. Weakness is provocative, and if anyone knows that, it is President Putin. We need to show strength, and that is why we need to pass this bill.

Finally, I want to talk briefly about an amendment I wanted to offer. I am still trying to get it offered as part of the NDAA. As I mentioned, there is a lineup of hundreds of amendments. Unfortunately, the leader on the other side of the aisle doesn’t want to move them. This is one of those amendments. It is a very bipartisan amendment. If it were allowed to come to the floor, it would probably pass over-

whelmingly. It is a simple amendment. All it does is ask the President to follow the law when it comes to raising the pay of members of our military. It is a simple amendment.

The law States that our servicemembers are entitled to get a larger pay increase—not much, but when there is a pay increase, they should get a slightly larger pay increase than their civilian counterparts. That is the current law. My amendment expresses the sense of the Senate that when giving a pay increase to members of the Department of Defense, military and civilian, that the President simply needs to follow the law.

I want to emphasize something as somebody who has served in the military and is still serving in the Reserves. Our civilian DOD employees and members do a superb job. They are patriotic, they work hard, and they deeply respect the members of the military with whom they serve. I have seen this throughout my entire career.

The current law, however, recognizes the unique sacrifices our servicemembers make wearing the uniform of our country and mandates a half-a-percent greater pay increase when there is a pay increase for our men and women in uniform. Right now, the President is not abiding by that law. It is simple. He needs to do it. My amendment would request and focus on this issue, and I think we could probably get 100 Senators to vote for it.

What is the origin of this law and the intent behind it? It is simple. It recognizes the unique sacrifices our men and women in the military make. These sacrifices are well known to the American people. They include long hours and serious, difficult separations from family. Of course, they include the risk of combat when our troops are deployed overseas in combat zones. It includes hardship to families. When our troops are deployed, they miss weddings, birthdays, first communions. It even takes training into account because the members of the military don’t work on a 9-to-5 basis.

I will give one example. I had the great opportunity to head out to the National Training Center in Fort Irwin, CA. It is one of the great training bases in our country—one of the great training places in the world. I was there to watch the training of the 1st Stryker Brigade, which is based in Fairbanks, AK. They were out there for a month deployment and training hard. They were not punching a clock 9 to 5; they were training around the clock every day.

I happened to be out there on Super Bowl Sunday. The vast majority of Americans were enjoying the Super Bowl, as they should have been. They were having fun, going to parties, watching the game, drinking Coke, Pepsi, and a little beer. But there were some Americans who were out in the middle of Fort Irwin in the desert training. They were not watching the Super Bowl; they were training to

make sure that when their country next called them up, they would be ready to protect our Nation. That is the reason this law states that we treat our military members a little bit different than other members of the Department of Defense.

That is all my amendment would do, but unfortunately, this one, like dozens, if not hundreds, is not going to be heard—at least for the time being—because the minority leader on the other side is trying to bring back the way they used to run the Senate last year and the year before and the year before that.

We know. We heard the stories. Last year, again, there were 14 amendments that were brought to the floor for a rollcall vote in 2014. They essentially shut down the greatest deliberative body in the world. We have heard the stories of how the previous majority leader used his position to block consideration of amendments more than twice as often as the previous six majority leaders combined, and now we are doing it on a bill that relates to the national security of our Nation and the critical issue of taking care of the men and women in uniform.

I hope we can move through this. I hope we can get to regular order. I hope this body can take up amendments such as mine—commonsense, bipartisan amendments that are going to keep our Nation safer, take care of our troops and their families, and give the American people faith that we are doing the job they sent us here to do. That is my hope.

We are already doing it under the new majority leader. We voted on almost 200 amendments already this year, but right now we are stuck on one of the most important bills this body will consider for the entire year. It is a shame. We need to get unstuck.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECTION 3112 OF S. CON. RES. 11

Mr. HATCH. On March 27, 2015, the Senate functioned properly by adopting S. Con. Res. 11 on the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 2016.

Section 3112 of that budget resolution contains a specification of procedures governing cost estimates for what is defined to be “major legislation” as defined in section 3112(c)(1).

I wish to provide a few comments to clarify that section of the budget resolution, and I understand that my distinguished colleague from Oregon, Finance Committee Ranking Member

WYDEN, also wishes to provide separate and related comments.

In setting out what is to be taken as “major legislation,” the budget resolution specifies that legislation may be designated to be “major” if the Senator or House Member who is chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation, or JCT, designates the legislation as such “for revenue legislation.” Of course, such language is entirely consistent with existing laws and practice, under which the responsibility and control over revenue estimates in the congressional budget process lies squarely with the chair and vice chair of the JCT.

The budget resolution also specifies that legislation may be designated to be “major” if the chair of the Committee on the Budget in the Senate or the House designates the legislation as such “for all direct spending and revenue legislation.” Of course, existing laws and practice assigns responsibility and control over spending estimates with the Budget Committees. However, the budget resolution includes “revenue legislation” as part of what the Budget Committee chairs may use for designating legislation as being “major.”

As I understand the intent of the language, when major legislation is to be considered, there can be cases in which the legislation may require estimates both from the JCT and from the Congressional Budget Office, or CBO. In such cases, there is nothing to prohibit use of longstanding practice in which the Budget Committees consult with the chair and vice chair of the JCT to ensure that any necessary revenue estimates are arrived at by the JCT, for use in scoring major legislation. To be clear, however, nothing in the budget resolution should be taken to mean that the chairs of the Budget Committees have authority to interfere with the responsibility and control over revenue estimates in any part of the congressional budget process which, as I identified earlier, lies squarely with the chair and vice chair of the JCT.

It is my understanding that the budget resolution does not direct or allow for any possibility of such interference, and my purpose in the remarks I am making today is to make that understanding clear. As I have mentioned, longstanding practice has been that if a need arises for the CBO to obtain information on major legislation from the JCT in terms of revenue estimates or effects of legislative proposals on marginal effective tax rates, Budget Committee members can ensure that those estimates and effects are obtained by consulting with the chair and vice chair of the JCT. This longstanding practice ensures smooth processing of the JCT’s workload, and prevents any direct control or intervention in JCT’s workload from other committees with other jurisdictions.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I share the concern of my colleague, the Finance Committee chairman, and I sup-

port his interpretation of this provision. In accordance with longstanding historical practice, and because of important practical considerations, the chair and vice chair of the Joint Committee on Taxation should exercise principal control over the revenue estimating process, and section 3112 should not be interpreted to authorize the chairs of the Budget Committees to interfere with JCT’s responsibility for and control over revenue estimates in any part of the congressional budget process.

However, I must note that on the broader point of dynamic estimates, I am opposed, and I was therefore opposed to section 3112 being included in the budget resolution and conference agreement to start with. Dynamic estimates rely on shaky math and convenient assumptions that reward advocates of tax cuts while punishing advocates of long-term investments in people and our Nation’s infrastructure.

FAIR ELECTIONS NOW ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it was 8 years ago that I first introduced the Fair Elections Now Act. Former Senator Arlen Specter, our late colleague and former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, was my lead cosponsor. We introduced the bill because we believed that America needs a system that rewards candidates with the best ideas and principles—not just the person who is the most talented in raising special interest money.

I noted that day that our democracy was in trouble because special interests and big-donor money were choking the system and preventing us from facing up to the big challenges of our time. Little did I know that almost a decade later, this problem would have grown much worse.

Through a series of recent cases—including the infamous Citizens United decision—the Supreme Court has allowed wealthy, well-connected campaign donors and special interests to unleash a deluge of cash in an effort to sway Federal, State, and local elections across our Nation. When it comes to understanding the influence of wealthy donors and special interests on Federal elections, the numbers speak for themselves.

In the 2012 election cycle, candidates for both the House and Senate raised the majority of their funds from large donations of \$1,000 or more. Forty percent of all contributions to Senate candidates came from donors who maxed out at the \$2,500 contribution limit, representing just 0.02 percent of the American population.

We saw this trend continue during the recent midterm elections. The 100 biggest donors gave a combined \$323 million during the 2014 election cycle through official campaign contributions and donations to national party committees, PACs, Super PACs, and 527 organizations. In contrast to those 100 donors, an estimated 4.75 million

people gave a comparable amount of \$356 million through small-dollar donations of \$200 or less. Astonishing as these figures are, they don’t include the \$173 million spent in the 2014 election cycle by tax-exempt “dark money” groups that are not required to publicly disclose their donors.

Deep-pocketed special interests are aiming to control the agenda in Congress. It is time to fight back and fundamentally reform the way we finance congressional elections. We need a system that allows candidates to focus on constituents instead of fundraising—a system that encourages ordinary Americans to make their voice heard with small, affordable donations to the candidate of their choice.

That is why I am once again introducing the Fair Elections Now Act. While this bill cannot solve all of the problems facing our Nation’s campaign finance system, the Fair Elections Now Act will dramatically change the way campaigns are funded. This bill allows candidates to focus on the people they represent, regardless of whether those people have the wealth to attend a big money fundraiser or donate thousands of dollars.

I would like to thank Sens. BALDWIN, BOXER, BROWN, FRANKEN, GILLIBRAND, HEINRICH, KLOBUCHAR, LEAHY, MARKEY, MCCASKILL, MENENDEZ, MERKLEY, MURPHY, SANDERS, SHAHEEN, UDALL, and WARREN for cosponsoring the Fair Elections Now Act and joining me in this effort to reform our campaign finance system.

The Fair Elections Now Act will help restore public confidence in congressional elections by providing qualified candidates for Congress with grants, matching funds, and vouchers from the Fair Elections Fund to replace campaign fundraising that largely relies on lobbyists, wealthy donors, corporations, and other special interests. In return, participating candidates would agree to limit their campaign spending to amounts raised from small-dollar donors plus the amounts provided from the Fair Elections Fund.

The Fair Elections system would have three stages for Senate candidates. First, candidates would need to prove their viability by raising a minimum number and amount of small-dollar qualifying contributions from in-state donors. Qualified candidates would then be required to limit the amount raised from each donor to \$150 per election.

In the primary, participants would receive a base grant that would vary in amount based on the population of the State that the candidate seeks to represent. Participants would also receive a 6 to 1 match for small-dollar donations up to a defined matching cap. After reaching that cap, the candidate could raise an unlimited amount of \$150 contributions, as well as contributions from small-donor People PACs.

In the general election, qualified candidates would receive an additional

grant, further small-dollar matching, and vouchers for purchasing television advertising. The candidate could continue to raise an unlimited amount of \$150 contributions, as well as contributions from small-donor People PACs.

Under the Fair Elections Now Act, candidates would have an incentive to seek small donations. And citizens would have an incentive to donate to the candidate of their choice, knowing that their small donation of \$150 would be converted to a \$900 donation through the 6 to 1 Fair Elections match.

Citizens would also be eligible for a modest, refundable tax credit. The Fair Elections Now Act establishes the “My Voice Tax Credit” to encourage individuals to make small donations to campaigns. Citizens could also make their voices heard by aggregating small contributions of \$150 or less into a type of small-donor political action committee, known as a “People PAC.” People PACs would then be permitted to make campaign contributions to qualified Fair Elections candidates. Coupled with the Fair Elections public financing system, People PACs would elevate the views and interests of a diverse spectrum of Americans, rather than those of the traditional, wealthy donor class.

Our country is facing major challenges. We need to continue to create more jobs and restore economic security for the middle class. We need to build and sustain our transportation infrastructure. We need to fix our broken immigration system. We need to ensure that the right to vote is protected and preserved.

But with high-powered, special interest lobbyists fighting every proposal to make our country stronger, it is incredibly difficult for members of Congress to make progress on behalf of their constituents. This bill would dramatically reduce the influence of these special interests and wealthy donors, because Fair Elections candidates would not need their money to run campaigns. As a result, the bill would enhance the voice of average Americans. Let me be clear: the overwhelming majority of people serving in American politics are good, honest people, and I believe that most members of Congress are guided by the best of intentions. But we are nonetheless stuck in a terrible, corrupting system.

A recent poll found bipartisan concerns about our current system. According to the poll, more than four out of five Americans say money plays too great a role in political campaigns. Two-thirds say that the wealthy have more of a chance to influence the electoral process than other Americans. The perception is that politicians are corrupted by big money interests . . . and whether that is true or not, that perception and the loss of trust that goes with it make it very difficult for Congress to solve tough issues.

This problem—the perception of pervasive corruption—is undermining our

democracy, and we must address it. Everyone is entitled to a seat at the table, but wealthy donors and big corporations shouldn't be able to buy every seat.

The Fair Elections Now Act will reform our campaign finance system so that members of Congress can focus on implementing policies in the best interest of the people who elected them—not just the wealthy donors and special interests that bankrolled their success. I urge my colleagues and the American people to support this important legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF LESTER CROWN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I recognize the 90th birthday of one of the outstanding business leaders of our time—Chicago businessman, Lester Crown.

Lester Crown was born on June 7, 1925, to Henry Crown, the son of Jewish immigrants from Lithuania, and his wife, Rebecca Kranz. Like many other Illinoisans, Lester came from a family of Lithuanian immigrants with humble beginnings who moved to America to pursue a better life for their children.

Lester's father worked hard with his two brothers to build their family construction supplies company, the Material Service Corporation. As a young man, Lester worked with his father at the Material Service's quarry over the summers to lend a hand. Through the hard work and dedication of the entire Crown family, the Material Service Corporation became one of the most successful companies in America. Several years later, that family business merged with General Dynamics Corporation to become America's largest defense contractor.

From the start, Lester saw his father's work and learned what it took to be a successful businessman. He used his experience to excel and quickly became the president of Marblehead Lime and Royal Crown (RC) Cola. After years of managing companies, Lester took over as chair of General Dynamics and as the head of the family investment firm.

One of Lester's many talents has been his ability to recognize great potential. His eye for promising investments has led him to grace the Forbes 400 list every year since 1982. With a quick glance at his impressive list of investments we can easily see why—he is a major shareholder in Maytag, Hilton Hotels, Alltel, Aspen Skiing Company, New York's Rockefeller Center, the New York Yankees, and Illinois' very own Chicago Bulls.

But Lester is not just a successful businessman, he is also a dedicated philanthropist, husband, and father. He has channeled his successes to provide generous contributions to a wide array of local and national projects. His charitable footprint can be seen in landmarks such as the famous Crown Fountain in Millennium Park, the Lyric

Opera of Chicago, Stroger Hospital, and in universities across the Nation.

Lester and his wife Renee have been happily married for more than 60 years and have seven children. Renee serves as a founding member and former president of the Women's Board of Northwestern University and a life director of the Multiple Sclerosis Society. She also serves on the board of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Chicago, the Field Museum, the Joffrey Ballet, and as an honorary chair of the Shoah Visual History Foundation.

Lester and Renee are an inspiration for many in their family who have become successful investors and philanthropists. Their son Jim is continuing the legacy started by Lester's father nearly a century ago by now serving as the lead director of General Dynamics. Together, the Crown family works with roughly 600 groups a year and donates millions of dollars annually to support organizations that focus on education and community development.

In addition to the energy Lester has poured into his family and business life, he has been a pillar in the Jewish-American community in his support of Israel. Few can match his dedicated commitment to the survival and success of the nation of Israel.

While few share Lester's long list of business achievements, even fewer share his level of leadership and generosity. It is with great pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 90th birthday of Lester Crown and to congratulate him on his legendary career and his many contributions to the city of Chicago, the Nation, and the world. I offer my best wishes as he continues to provide visionary leadership through his business endeavors and family philanthropy for years to come.

CONFIRMATION OF ERIC MILLER TO BE VERMONT'S U.S. ATTORNEY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last night, the Senate confirmed Eric Miller to be Vermont's 37th U.S. attorney. I am confident that he will do an outstanding job as the top Federal law enforcement officer in the State. Before recommending Eric to the President, I consulted prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges, law enforcement officials, and civic leaders throughout Vermont. They were unanimous in their support for Eric. I was particularly impressed with his thoughtfulness, vision, and depth of experience. Eric Miller is one of Vermont's leading trial attorneys. He is well regarded by State and local law enforcement and leaders in Vermont's legal community.

Eric Miller has worked since 1999 in the Burlington office of the law firm Sheehey Furlong & Behm PC, serving as partner since 2002. He has litigated a range of complex issues in Federal civil and criminal cases, including trials and appeals. As an appointee to the Criminal Justice Act panel of the U.S. District Court for the District of Vermont,

Eric has also represented indigent defendants in serious felony cases involving narcotics, weapons, and immigration-related charges. He clerked for the Honorable Fred Parker on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in Burlington. He has a law degree from Yale University and an undergraduate degree from Duke University.

I thank Eric for his willingness to continue to serve Vermont and I congratulate him on his confirmation.

SENATE COMPETITIVE CAUCUS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, the hallmark of our Nation's economy has long been the ability of anyone with creativity, ambition, and a good work ethic to realize their dreams and move America forward. From the lightbulb to the iPhone, the legacy of American invention has shone brightly throughout the world. Yet while our culture of innovation and entrepreneurial spirit remain strong, the policy framework that empowers that spirit to flourish is losing its competitive edge.

For years, enabling our Nation's innovative drive was an economic system unparalleled around the world—from competitive tax laws to public investments in research, infrastructure, and education. We have long understood something that many other countries haven't: for innovation and the entrepreneurial spirit to thrive, we need a strong, competitive economic ecosystem. There simply is no single silver bullet for economic growth.

While other nations catch up, our system is deteriorating in a number of ways. Federal investments in basic research and development are not keeping up with inflation and our tax code remains riddled with complexity, unable to spur growth and provide the certainty our businesses need. We also have to address the tough questions about how to fund our infrastructure, transportation, and education systems. In our dynamic market economy, the natural churn of businesses opening and closing keeps our Nation competitive, as long as we are creating more businesses than we are closing, of course. According to the Census Bureau, however, U.S. businesses are now failing faster than they are being created for the first time in 35 years—since the data began being recorded. Meanwhile, the 2014 Global Innovation Index saw the U.S. innovation ecosystem fall to 6th, while ranking 39th in ease of starting a business. These declines are coupled to a global R&D forecast that projects leading competitors—like China—will surpass the U.S. in total R&D investment by 2022.

Yet even with these challenges, we do retain a competitive edge. Americans' entrepreneurial drive still spurs our economy; manufacturing output continues to increase; our colleges and universities remain the envy of the world; innovations in the American energy industry have reduced our trade deficit and improved our energy secu-

rity; and private sector R&D has rebounded after several years of stagnation.

We now find ourselves at a competitive inflection point. We can either do more to nurture and take advantage of our strengths—only some of which we have mentioned—or we can fall behind in the 21st century. In order to support our competitive strengths, Senator JERRY MORAN and I are launching the bipartisan Senate Competitiveness Caucus, a forum to bring together Democrats and Republicans to address the most pressing issues facing our economy.

Rather than focus on just one issue or one bill, we have built the caucus with the understanding that it will take a whole range of policies working in concert to sustain our innovation ecosystem.

We will pursue ways to invest in our roads, bridges, ports, and highways so they meet the needs of a 21st century economy. We will work to make our tax code more competitive so the United States will remain the best country in which to do business and raise a family. We will seek to streamline regulations to protect consumers and make it easier to start and grow a business. We will look at our Federal budget and focus Federal resources on pro-growth policies that will create an environment for job creation now and into the future. We will work together to boost manufacturing because no country can support a strong middle class without a thriving manufacturing sector. That is just a start.

If the last century has taught us anything, it is that other countries will not slow down when it comes to chasing America's economic success. That means that even though the United States remains a world leader in innovation and competitiveness, it will only become more difficult to retain that position as the years go by. Members of the Competitiveness Caucus understand that we are now competing with every country, every government, every worker, and every business on the planet. Congress must come together to turn our economic challenges into opportunities for growth.

HEALTH INFORMATION EXCHANGE: A PATH TOWARDS IMPROVING THE QUALITY AND VALUE OF HEALTH CARE FOR PATIENTS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks at the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing earlier this week.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH INFORMATION EXCHANGE: A PATH TOWARDS IMPROVING THE QUALITY AND VALUE OF HEALTH CARE FOR PATIENTS

We're here today to outline our plans to conduct an intensive review of electronic health records.

There is a great deal of bipartisan interest in this on the committee. My staff and Sen. Murray's staff have been meeting with experts every day, the staff of each of our committee members have been meeting once a week, and Sen Murray and myself have been speaking with the administration regularly as well.

The administration understands our level of interest and is working with us to improve these records.

Here's what we're talking about:

The Meaningful Use Program began in 2009 to encourage the 491,000 physicians who serve Medicaid and Medicare patients and almost 4,500 hospitals who serve those patients to begin to adopt and use electronic health records systems.

Of those 491,000 physicians, 456,000 have received some sort of Medicare or Medicaid incentive payment from the Meaningful Use Program. All hospitals and most physicians that tried were able to meet the first stage requirements. For those who met the requirements, the government paid incentive payments in the form of higher Medicare reimbursements. It has so far paid out \$30 billion in incentive payments.

But the program's stage 2 requirements are so complex that only about 11 percent of eligible physicians have been able to comply so far, and just about 42 percent of eligible hospitals have been able to comply.

The next step in the program is penalties for doctors and hospitals that don't comply. This year, 257,000 physicians have already begun losing 1 percent of their Medicare reimbursements and 200 hospitals may be losing even more than that.

Our goal is to identify the 5 or 6 steps we can take to improve electronic health records—a technology that has great promise, but has, through bad policy and bad incentives, run off track.

To put it bluntly, physicians and doctors have said to me that they are literally "terrified" on the next implementation stage of electronic health records, called Meaningful Use Stage 3, because of its complexity and because of the fines that will be levied.

My goal is that before that phase is implemented, we can work with physicians and hospitals and the administration to get the system back on track and make it a tool that hospitals and physicians can look forward to using to help their patients instead of something they dread.

Today will mark the start of a series of hearings we will hold this summer to address various possible solutions.

Senator Murray and I are today announcing the next two hearings in the series, which will be chaired by different members of our committee to examine solutions to the problems we identify.

The first hearing is on the burden physicians face with these systems, and I have asked Senator Cassidy, who is a physician himself, to chair that hearing.

The second hearing is on the question of whether you and I control information about our health, and I have asked Senator Collins to chair that hearing.

On March 17, we held our first hearing to identify the problems with electronic health records, and the government's Meaningful Use Program.

At today's hearing, we will set the table for this series of hearings by discussing how we can solve those problems and improve electronic health records.

I was in Nashville at Vanderbilt University two weeks ago for a public workshop of the National Institutes of Health Precision Medicine Working Group, which is working out the details of the president's precision medicine initiative. That will involve creating a collection of 1 million sequenced genomes

that researchers and scientists and doctors nationwide can consult in treating patients and curing diseases.

It's cutting edge medicine that has the potential to change the way we treat everything from diabetes to cancer.

But it will only work the way it's supposed to if electronic health records systems work the way they are supposed to.

Number one, electronic health records can help to assemble and understand the genomes of the one million individuals. And, second, if we want to make genetic information useful, being able to exchange information will help doctors when they write a prescription for you.

So that's just one important medical breakthrough initiative that will rely on a big improvement to electronic health records.

This committee is interested not least because the government has invested \$30 billion to encourage doctors and hospitals to install these expensive systems.

The program has increased adoption. According to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), since 2009, the percentage of physicians with a basic electronic health record system has grown from 22 percent to 48 percent. And the percentage of hospitals with a basic records system has grown from 12 percent to 59 percent. But the program hasn't done enough to make the systems easy to use or interoperable—meaning able to communicate with one another—or really achieved much beyond adoption.

According to a Medical Economics survey nearly 70 percent of physicians say their electronic health record systems have not been worth it. They are spending more time taking notes than taking care of patients, and they are spending a lot of their own money on systems that have to comply with government requirements, not satisfying their own needs to serve patients with the latest in cutting edge medicine that could be accessed with the kind of technology Health IT is supposed to promise.

Or as the conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer, a doctor himself, wrote recently: "The EHR technology, being in its infancy, is hopelessly inefficient. Hospital physicians will tell you endless tales about the wastefulness of the data collection and how the lack of interoperability defeats the very purpose of data sharing."

Today we have invited experts representing various perspectives:

Medical informatics, the profession focused on what information to use and how to use it to improve care; a records system vendor, one of the companies tasked with building the records systems; a health system chief information officer, the expert in charge of implementing Health IT for a hospital's many different types of care providers across many different types of care settings; and the perspective of the patient so that we can hear recommendations on how improvements in Health IT can improve the patient experience and patient involvement in their own care.

I am especially interested to hear from our witnesses their recommendations to improve the exchange of health information, which has been a glaring failure of the current state of electronic health records.

Patients will receive better care if we can improve the exchange of information so that a patient's health record can be accessed by physicians and pharmacists in an efficient and reliable way, the term industry experts use for this exchange of information is interoperability.

We're fortunate that a report was published May 28, 2015, by the American Medical Informatics Association offering immediate strategies to the challenges in electronic

health records that I've been detailing. The report was written by a task force of experts from all aspects of Health IT: physicians, researchers, vendors, patient advocates, and others.

We know that improvements need to be made to these programs, and they need to be done quickly. One of the things I like about this report is that the recommendations are targeted for the next 6 to 12 months and could make improvements quickly.

The report makes recommendations in these five areas:

Simplify and speed documentation—that means using technology to help doctors spend less time taking notes and more time taking care of patients.

Refocus regulation—that means the government requirements should be clear, simple, and streamlined towards better patient care.

Increase transparency and streamline certification, such as using detailed tests for records systems to receive certification, so purchasers can easily judge performance and compare products.

Foster innovation—The brilliant minds working in Information Technology should be allowed to innovate new ideas, not just react to satisfying government ideas for Health IT. Standards are important, but they should support and enable innovations—not stifle them.

And "support person-centered care delivery"—Today, with a click of a mouse or a swipe on a smart phone, one can see the prices for airplane tickets from competing airlines or, mortgage rates from hundreds of banks. But, in health care, Information Technology has not made much difference to the patient experience. Patients still fill out paper forms with clipboards at every doctor appointment, call multiple offices to make appointments, and piece together their health information one doctor office and one hospital visit at a time. Electronic health records could change that experience for all of us so that when an individual visits a doctor, his care team can access his information no matter where the patient has been or which doctors he's seen in the past and deliver more accurate and higher quality care for the patient.

I look forward to hearing our witnesses' recommendations, their thoughts on this report, and also advice on how we can make improvements as quickly as possible.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

• Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Kiwanis International for its 100th anniversary celebration. Since its formation in 1915, Kiwanis has become a global service organization, supporting communities both in its Indianapolis headquarters and beyond.

Last year, I had the pleasure of meeting Stan Soderstrom, who serves as the executive director of Kiwanis International and oversees the organization's branches and clubs in 80 nations, from the Kiwanis Club of Pike Township in Indianapolis. With a hands-on approach and great leadership from folks like Stan, as well as previous leaders such as State Representative Christina Hale, Kiwanis clubs provide a

place for fellowship, as well as personal and community growth. Kiwanis and its affiliates boast more than 600,000 members who raise more than \$100 million and contribute more than 18 million volunteer hours each year. Their impact is tremendous and felt globally.

In the State of Indiana, there are more than 190 Kiwanis clubs and more than 6,000 adult members participating in a wide variety of charitable efforts. Kiwanis has served the Indianapolis area by providing everything from playground projects to scholarship programs. Hoosier Kiwanis clubs have raised more than \$234,000 to benefit the Child Life program at Riley Hospital for Children and contributed more than \$1.1 million toward the Eliminate Project, which works with developing countries to help immunize millions of women in the fight against maternal and neonatal tetanus. These Hoosiers serve as an example of the hard work and service that make Indiana a great place to live. Each year, Kiwanis clubs in Indiana serve nearly 300,000 children and youths, raise more than \$1.1 million, and donate more than 50,000 volunteer hours of invaluable service. I commend the Indiana district Kiwanis leaders for these great accomplishments in doing good for Indiana communities and the world.

On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I congratulate and thank each and every member of Kiwanis International for helping Kiwanis evolve into the thriving and impactful organization that it is today. For a century, Kiwanians have faithfully served their local communities and communities around the world. I wish them continued growth and success for many more years to come.●

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS ROBOTICS TEAM

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, UNLV, robotics team on being selected as one of the top ten in the world by competing in the 2015 U.S. Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency Robotics Challenge. The competition included a dozen teams from the United States, including the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Lockheed Martin. Eleven teams from Japan, Germany, Italy, South Korea, and Hong Kong also participated.

The competition was initially created in response to the humanitarian need after the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear reactor incident in 2011. The goal of the program remains to accelerate the development of advanced robots capable of entering areas too dangerous for humans and acting as first responders in the disaster zone. The robots chosen as finalists, including UNLV's Metal Rebel, competed in eight tasks related to disaster response, including climbing stairs, turning valves, tripping circuit breakers, walking among

rubble, and driving alone. Metal Rebel took eighth place out of 23 teams, bringing in a score of 6 out of 8 and a time of 57:41. This team of students and faculty stands as a tribute to what dedication and hard work can achieve. I am proud to call them fellow Nevadans.

The team of 15 UNLV engineering students was led by Paul Oh, Lincy professor of unmanned aerial systems and expert in robotics and autonomous systems for UNLV's Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering. Mr. Oh joined the competition to help UNLV and Nevada become a national leader in the autonomous systems industry. He was also the former program director for the National Science Foundation robotics. His work for this university and our State is greatly appreciated.

I am excited to see local students and faculty bringing recognition to both Nevada and to UNLV for their advancement in a global competition. These students should be proud to call themselves top contenders in this international competition. I ask my colleagues to join me and all Nevadans in congratulating UNLV for its success and honorable representation of Nevada.●

CONGRATULATING BECKY
BOSSHART, MICHAEL PFURR,
ROHAN DHARAN, MICHAEL
MONCRIEFF, AND RYAN LARSEN

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize five of Nevada's brightest students—Becky Bosshart, Michael Pfurr, Rohan Dharan, Michael Moncrieff, and Ryan Larsen—on being selected as 2015 recipients of the Fulbright scholarship.

The Fulbright Scholar Program was developed shortly after World War II by former U.S. Senator James William Fulbright due to language barriers experienced by Americans and their allies during the war. Students selected for the program study and teach English abroad, building upon their language skills, as well as growing international good will. The scholarship is highly competitive, with thousands applying from colleges and universities across the country. I am proud to congratulate these five students on their achievement, as well as the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, UNLV, on receiving its largest amount of Fulbright scholarship selections in a single year in Rebel history. The students are shining examples of how hard work leads to success, and stand as role models for future Rebels.

The five students will teach English and expand upon their language skills in countries from Eastern Europe to Asia. Ms. Bosshart served in the Peace Corps in Chernivisti, Ukraine, and worked diligently to return to Eastern Europe. She will spend her time in Romania. Mr. LARSEN spent the last 6 years mentoring Fulbright scholarship applicants and will spend time in Japan. Mr. Moncrieff will complete his

Ph.D. while studying in Kistanje, Croatia. Mr. Dharan, a member of Teach for America, will expand upon his teaching experience in New Delhi, India. Finally, Mr. Pfurr will build upon his experience in Austria. I am proud to call these excellent students ambassadors for not only the United States, but also for Nevada, throughout their journeys.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these exceptional young Nevadans. These students worked hard for this incredible opportunity, and I wish them the best of luck in their future endeavors.●

CONGRATULATING WOODY
OVERTON

● Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I congratulate my good friend Woody Overton on his retirement after 14 years as director of governmental affairs and community relations at JE Dunn Construction and his many years of leadership and service to Kansas City. Woody demonstrated exceptional professionalism, and I am pleased to recognize his outstanding career today.

Woody, a native of Trenton, MO, received his bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Missouri—Kansas City. He is a U.S. Army veteran and is deeply involved with nonprofit and civic organizations in the Kansas City area.

Woody served as assistant to former U.S. Senator Thomas Eagleton in charge of major projects and constituent services from 1977 to 1986. He learned from the best and embodied the lessons he learned from Senator Eagleton throughout his life and career. Each time you talk to Woody he will share a lesson he learned through an anecdote. That time in his life was the defining moment of his career, and his love of public service and community involvement came directly from his respect and admiration for his boss and friend, Senator Tom Eagleton.

In 1992, Woody ran the Clinton Presidential campaign in Missouri, helping President Clinton secure a must-win State by ten points. In 1993, Woody was appointed as the Regional Administrator of the General Services Administration's, GSA, Heartland Region which includes Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas. Woody served as its chief executive officer and regional liaison to other Federal agencies, State and local Governments. Woody's leadership and accomplishments in providing better customer service to Federal agencies earned him the GSA Administrator's "Exceptional Service Award" in May 2001.

Woody's ability to work with Democrats and Republicans to help Kansas City remain a Federal regional center during his tenure as head of Kansas City's GSA should be commended. He oversaw construction of several important Kansas City buildings including the Federal courthouse, the Illus W. Davis Civic Mall, the FBI office, and

the Agriculture Department complex and in Kansas City, Kansas another courthouse and the Environmental Protection Agency headquarters.

Woody is looking forward to spending more time with his family, and especially his grandchildren. I know they will enjoy the opportunity to spend more time with him.

It is my pleasure to honor Woody Overton today. He has touched the lives of many and immensely improved the Kansas City community.

I ask that the Senate join me in congratulating and honoring Glen W. "Woody" Overton.●

RECOGNIZING MAINSTREET SELF
STORAGE

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses are able to recognize what their neighbors and communities need, and what is even more impressive is that they are able to meet those needs quickly and efficiently. This is especially important when a natural disaster strikes. That is why this week's Small Business of the Week is Mainstreet Self Storage of Shreveport, LA.

Northwest Louisiana is currently struggling with major flooding, which has driven families out of their homes and shut down small businesses. In response, Mainstreet Self Storage is doing its part to help those affected by offering free storage space for the next 3 months. Through this program, Mainstreet aims to provide folks a safe, secure space to store their belongings—truly a fine example of Louisiana's ingenuity and generosity.

In May of 2009, the Delaney family opened a facility offering storage and moving solutions for Shreveport-Bossier city residents. Mainstreet Self Storage's complex is comprised of climate-controlled units, nonclimate controlled-units, car garages, cover RV storage, and open or closed storage for boats and vehicles. Mainstreet's top-of-the-line security system and humidity-controlled units give clients a peace of mind in the stowing of their belongings. Shortly after opening, Mainstreet partnered with the U-Haul company in order to offer moving and transportation equipment to their customers. In the years since, Mainstreet Self Storage has become a Top 100 U-Haul Dealer and was recently named the eighth in the Nation for customer service.

Congratulations to MainStreet Storage for being selected as the Small Business of the Week. We appreciate and recognize your generosity and commitment to aiding your neighbors in Northwest Louisiana during these times of need.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting nominations which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:31 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 bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2393. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of the 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 23. A bill to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-62).

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1558. An original bill making appropriations for Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-63).

By Mrs. CAPITO, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2250. A bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-64).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 756. A bill to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria.

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. THUNE (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. RUBIO):
S. 1551. A bill to provide for certain requirements relating to the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority stewardship transition; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DAINES:
S. 1552. A bill to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. COATS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SASSE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. TOOMEY):
S. 1553. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):
S. 1554. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study with respect to stormwater runoff from oil and gas operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Mr. REID, Mr. KAINÉ, and Mr. SCHATZ):
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; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):
S. 1556. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):
S. 1557. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COCHRAN:
S. 1558. An original bill making appropriations for Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. PETERS):
S. 1559. A bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):
S. 1560. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide end-users with a reasonable amount of time to meet their margin requirements and to repeal certain indemnification requirements for regulatory authorities to obtain access to swap data required to be provided by swaps entities; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):
S. 1561. A bill to clarify the definition of nonadmitted insurer under the Nonadmitted and Reinsurance Reform Act of 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN:
S. 1562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MENENDEZ):
S. 1563. A bill to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to extend, enhance, and revise the provisions relating to collection, use, and disclosure of personal information of children, to establish certain other protections for personal information of children and minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SANDERS:
S. 1564. A bill to require that employers provide not less than 10 days of paid vacation time to eligible employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINÉ, and Ms. HIRONO):
S. 1565. A bill to allow the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to provide greater protection to servicemembers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):
S. 1566. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for coverage of oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the coverage provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. TILLIS):
S. 1567. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for a review of the characterization or terms of discharge from the Armed Forces of individuals with mental health disorders alleged to affect terms of discharge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. BENNET):
S. 1568. A bill to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. TESTER, and Mrs. FISCHER):
S. 1569. A bill to require a review of the adequacy of existing procedures to ensure at least one employee of the personal office of each Senator serving on a committee that requires access to top secret and sensitive compartmented information may obtain the

security clearances necessary for the employee to have access to such information; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 1570. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce to establish public-private partnerships under the Market Development Cooperator Program of the International Trade Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. Res. 199. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding establishing a National Strategic Agenda; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 200. A resolution wishing His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama a happy 80th birthday on July 6, 2015, and recognizing the outstanding contributions His Holiness has made to the promotion of nonviolence, human rights, interfaith dialogue, environmental awareness, and democracy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 146

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 146, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes.

S. 280

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 280, a bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from North Da-

kota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to safeguard data stored abroad from improper government access, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, *supra*.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to enable hospital-based nursing programs that are affiliated with a hospital to maintain payments under the Medicare program to hospitals for the costs of such programs.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the ef-

fectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 1049

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to allow the financing by United States persons of sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1115

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1115, a bill to close out expired, empty grant accounts.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term "waters of the United States", and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SASSE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, *supra*.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1178

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1178, a bill to prohibit implementation of a proposed rule relating to the definition of the term "waters of the United States" under the Clean Water Act, or any substantially similar rule, until a Supplemental Scientific Review Panel and Ephemeral and Intermittent Streams Advisory Committee produce certain reports, and for other purposes.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to exempt application of JSA attribution rule in case of existing agreements.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act.

S. 1476

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1476, a bill to require States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding shooting incidents involving law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending.

AMENDMENT NO. 1473

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1473 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1559

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1559 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1567

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1567 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1578

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1578 proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1605

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1605 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1771

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1771 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1783

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1783 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1987

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1987 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1552. A bill to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1552

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 “Clean Water for Rural Communities Act”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to ensure a safe and adequate municipal, rural, and industrial water supply for the citizens of—

(1) Dawson, Garfield, McCone, Prairie, Richland, Judith Basin, Wheatland, Golden Valley, Fergus, Yellowstone, and Musselshell Counties in the State of Montana; and

(2) McKenzie County, North Dakota.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration.

(2) AUTHORITY.—The term “Authority” means—

(A) in the case of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System—

(i) the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority, which is a publicly owned nonprofit water authority formed in accordance with Mont. Code Ann. § 75-6-302 (2007); and

(ii) any nonprofit successor entity to the Authority described in clause (i); and

(B) in the case of the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System—

(i) the Central Montana Regional Water Authority, which is a publicly owned nonprofit water authority formed in accordance with Mont. Code Ann. § 75-6-302 (2007); and

(ii) any nonprofit successor entity to the Authority described in clause (i).

(3) DRY-REDWATER REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY SYSTEM.—The term “Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System” means the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System authorized under section 4(a)(1) with a project service area that includes—

(A) Garfield and McCone Counties in the State;

(B) the area west of the Yellowstone River in the Dawson and Richland Counties in the State;

(C) T. 15 N. (including the area north of the Township) in Prairie County in the State; and

(D) the portion of McKenzie County, North Dakota, that includes all land that is located west of the Yellowstone River in the State of North Dakota.

(4) INTEGRATED SYSTEM.—The term “integrated system” means the transmission system owned by the Western Area Power Administration Basin Electric Power District and the Heartland Consumers Power District.

(5) MUSSELHELL-JUDITH RURAL WATER SYSTEM.—The term “Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System” means the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System authorized under section 4(a)(2) with a project service area that includes—

(A) Judith Basin, Wheatland, Golden Valley, and Musselshell Counties in the State;

(B) the portion of Yellowstone County in the State within 2 miles of State Highway 3 and within 4 miles of the county line between Golden Valley and Yellowstone Counties in the State, inclusive of the Town of Broadview, Montana; and

(C) the portion of Fergus County in the State within 2 miles of US Highway 87 and within 4 miles of the county line between Fergus and Judith Basin Counties in the State, inclusive of the Town of Moore, Montana.

(6) **NON-FEDERAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.**—The term “non-Federal distribution system” means a non-Federal utility that provides electricity to the counties covered by the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System.

(7) **PICK-SLOAN PROGRAM.**—The term “Pick-Sloan program” means the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program (authorized by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (commonly known as the “Flood Control Act of 1944”) (58 Stat. 891, chapter 665)).

(8) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(9) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Montana.

(10) **WATER SYSTEM.**—The term “Water System” means—

(A) the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System; and

(B) the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System.

SEC. 4. DRY-REDWATER REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY SYSTEM AND MUSSELHELL-JUDITH RURAL WATER SYSTEM.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary may carry out—

(1) the project entitled the “Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System” in a manner that is substantially in accordance with the feasibility study entitled “Dry-Redwater Regional Water System Feasibility Study” (including revisions of the study), which received funding from the Bureau of Reclamation on September 1, 2010; and

(2) the project entitled the “Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System” in a manner that is substantially in accordance with the feasibility report entitled “Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System Feasibility Report” (including any and all revisions of the report).

(b) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.**—The Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the Authority to provide Federal assistance for the planning, design, and construction of the Water Systems.

(c) **COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal share of the costs relating to the planning, design, and construction of the Water Systems shall not exceed—

(i) in the case of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System—

(I) 75 percent of the total cost of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System; or

(II) such other lesser amount as may be determined by the Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation, in a feasibility report; or

(ii) in the case of the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System, 75 percent of the total cost of the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System.

(B) **LIMITATION.**—Amounts made available under subparagraph (A) shall not be returnable or reimbursable under the reclamation laws.

(2) **USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.**—

(A) **GENERAL USES.**—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Water Systems may use Federal funds made available to carry out this section for—

(i) facilities relating to—

(I) water pumping;

(II) water treatment; and

(III) water storage;

(ii) transmission pipelines;

(iii) pumping stations;

(iv) appurtenant buildings, maintenance equipment, and access roads;

(v) any interconnection facility that connects a pipeline of the Water System to a pipeline of a public water system;

(vi) electrical power transmission and distribution facilities required for the operation and maintenance of the Water System;

(vii) any other facility or service required for the development of a rural water distribution system, as determined by the Secretary; and

(viii) any property or property right required for the construction or operation of a facility described in this subsection.

(B) **ADDITIONAL USES.**—In addition to the uses described in subparagraph (A)—

(i) the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System may use Federal funds made available to carry out this section for—

(I) facilities relating to water intake; and

(II) distribution, pumping, and storage facilities that—

(aa) serve the needs of citizens who use public water systems;

(bb) are in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(cc) may be purchased, improved, and repaired in accordance with a cooperative agreement entered into by the Secretary under subsection (b); and

(ii) the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System may use Federal funds made available to carry out this section for—

(I) facilities relating to—

(aa) water supply wells; and

(bb) distribution pipelines; and

(II) control systems.

(C) **LIMITATION.**—Federal funds made available to carry out this section shall not be used for the operation, maintenance, or replacement of the Water Systems.

(D) **TITLE.**—Title to the Water Systems shall be held by the Authority.

SEC. 5. USE OF POWER FROM PICK-SLOAN PROGRAM BY THE DRY-REDWATER REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY SYSTEM.

(a) **FINDING.**—Congress finds that—

(1) McCone and Garfield Counties in the State were designated as impact counties during the period in which the Fort Peck Dam was constructed; and

(2) as a result of the designation, the Counties referred to in paragraph (1) were to receive impact mitigation benefits in accordance with the Pick-Sloan program.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF POWER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Administrator shall make available to the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System a quantity of power required, of up to 1½ megawatt capacity, to meet the pumping and incidental operation requirements of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System during the period beginning on May 1 and ending on October 31 of each year—

(A) from the water intake facilities; and

(B) through all pumping stations, water treatment facilities, reservoirs, storage tanks, and pipelines up to the point of delivery of water by the water supply system to all storage reservoirs and tanks and each entity that distributes water at retail to individual users.

(2) **ELIGIBILITY.**—The Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System shall be eligible to receive power under paragraph (1) if the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System—

(A) operates on a not-for-profit basis; and

(B) is constructed pursuant to a cooperative agreement entered into by the Secretary under section 4(b).

(3) **RATE.**—The Administrator shall establish the cost of the power described in paragraph (1) at the firm power rate.

(4) **ADDITIONAL POWER.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If power, in addition to that made available to the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System under paragraph (1), is necessary to meet the pumping requirements of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority, the Administrator may purchase the necessary additional power at the best available rate.

(B) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—The cost of purchasing additional power shall be reimbursed to the Administrator by the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority.

(5) **RESPONSIBILITY FOR POWER CHARGES.**—The Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority shall be responsible for the payment of the power charge described in paragraph (4) and non-Federal delivery costs described in paragraph (6).

(6) **TRANSMISSION ARRANGEMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System shall be responsible for all non-Federal transmission and distribution system delivery and service arrangements.

(B) **UPGRADES.**—The Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System shall be responsible for funding any transmission upgrades, if required, to the integrated system necessary to deliver power to the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System.

SEC. 6. WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act—

(1) preempts or affects any State water law; or

(2) affects any authority of a State, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, to manage water resources within that State.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the planning, design, and construction of the Water Systems, substantially in accordance with the cost estimate set forth in the applicable feasibility study or feasibility report described in section 4(a).

(b) **COST INDEXING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) may be increased or decreased in accordance with ordinary fluctuations in development costs incurred after the applicable date specified in paragraph (2), as indicated by any available engineering cost indices applicable to construction activities that are similar to the construction of the Water Systems.

(2) **APPLICABLE DATES.**—The date referred to in paragraph (1) is—

(A) in the case of the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System, January 1, 2008; and

(B) in the case of the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water Authority System, November 1, 2014.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1556. A bill to amend section 455(m) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to allow adjunct faculty members to qualify for public service loan forgiveness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I introduced the Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act, a bill that would enable faculty working less than full-time to participate in the Public Service Student Loan Forgiveness Program.

Contingent faculty members are like full-time instructors. They have advanced degrees. They teach classes and

spend many hours outside the classroom preparing for class. They hold office hours, grade papers and give feedback to students. They provide advice and write letters of recommendation. Students rely on them. Since most adjuncts have advanced degrees and, as almost 75 percent of graduate degree recipients have an average of \$61,000 in student loans, they are also among the 40 million Americans with student debt.

The Public Service Loan Forgiveness program is meant to encourage graduates to go into public service by offering student loan forgiveness for eligible federal loans after 10 years of full-time work in government or the non-profit sector. Public service fields like nursing, military service, and public health qualify. Many education jobs qualify, including full-time work at public universities and part-time work at community colleges in high-needs subject areas or areas of shortage. But other faculty members, those who work part-time, are not eligible for loan forgiveness because the law requires an annual average of 30 hours per week to qualify for the program. For adjunct faculty working at several schools on a contingent basis, this requirement can be difficult or impossible to meet, even when they are putting in more than 30 hours of work each week.

The number of faculty hours given for each class is calculated differently at different schools. Some give one hour per hour in the classroom while others actually take into consideration the time required outside the classroom. So, even as these faculty members are working hard and as their options for tenured, full-time positions become slimmer, more of them are overworked and undervalued for their work in public service.

The Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2015 would solve this by amending the Higher Education Act to expand the definition of a “public service job” to include a part-time faculty member who teaches at least one course at an eligible institution of higher education. They would still have to meet all the other requirements to qualify for the program, including making 120 on-time payments while employed at a qualifying institution, and they could not be employed full-time elsewhere at the same time.

This bill would benefit someone like Alyson, an adjunct professor from Chicago, IL, who graduated with \$65,000 in student loan debt and, after 10 years of on-time payments, has over \$56,000 left. Like most adjuncts, Alyson strings together multiple teaching assignments along with part-time work to afford her monthly living expenses and minimum student loan payment. She comes from a family of educators and considers teaching her dream job. Alyson would like to participate in the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program. This bill would ensure that Alyson and many thousands like her,

could obtain credit towards the Public Service Loan Program for loan payments she made while teaching, whether she was teaching one course or seven.

Unfortunately, for all their contributions to the college programs and the students they work with, adjunct faculty don't have the same employment benefits or job security as their colleagues. The number of classes they teach every semester varies. To make ends meet, these professors often end up teaching classes at more than one school in the same semester, getting paid about \$3,000 per class and making an average annual income that hovers around minimum wage. This also means that, in some parts of the country, they spend as much time commuting as they do teaching.

Nationally, over half of all higher education faculty work on a contingent basis, facing low pay with little or no benefits or job security. In the past, these were a minority of professors who were hired to teach an occasional class because they could bring experience to the classroom in a specific field or industry. Over time, as university budgets have tightened and it has gotten more expensive to hire full-time, tenure track professors, higher education institutions have increasingly hired adjuncts.

From 1991 to 2011, the number of part-time faculty in the U.S. increased two and a half times from 291,000 to over 760,000. At the same time, the percentage of professors holding tenure-track positions has been steadily decreasing—from 45 percent of all instructors in 1975 to only 24 percent in 2011. The number of full-time instructors, tenured and non-tenured, now makes up only about 50 percent of professors on U.S. campuses. The other 50 percent of the 1.5 million faculty employees at public and non-profit colleges and universities in the U.S. work on a part-time, contingent basis.

Illinois colleges rely heavily on adjuncts. In 2012, 53 percent of all faculty at public and not-for-profit colleges and universities in the State, more than 30,400 faculty employees, worked on a part-time basis. This is a 52.6 percent increase in part-time faculty in Illinois compared to a 13 percent increase in full-time faculty since 2002.

Not surprisingly, in Illinois, 69 percent of all part-time faculty work in Chicago, where the cost of living is 16 percent higher than the U.S. average. Based on an average payment of \$3,000 per class an adjunct professor must teach between 17 and 30 classes a year to pay for rent and utilities in Chicago.

They would have to teach up to seven classes to afford groceries for a family of four and two to four classes per year just to cover student loan payments. Because they are part-time, they are not eligible for vacation time, paid sick days, or group health-care. So they would have to teach an additional two to three classes to afford family coverage from the lowest priced health

insurance offered on Get Covered Illinois, the official health marketplace.

Even though these professors are working in a relatively low-paying field, teaching our students, their part-time status also means they aren't eligible for the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program

This bill does not completely fix this growing reliance on part-time professors who are underpaid and undervalued. But it would ensure that members of the contingent faculty workforce are no longer excluded from the loan forgiveness program for public servants. I would like to thank my colleague, Senator AL FRANKEN from Minnesota for joining me in this effort. I hope my other colleagues will also join me to provide this benefit to faculty members who provide our students with a quality education.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1556

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 “Adjunct Faculty Loan Fairness Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR ADJUNCT FACULTY.

Section 455(m)(3)(B)(ii) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(m)(3)(B)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking “teaching as” and inserting the following: “teaching—

“(I) as”;

(2) by striking “, foreign language faculty, and part-time faculty at community colleges), as determined by the Secretary.” and inserting “and foreign language faculty), as determined by the Secretary; or”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(II) as a part-time faculty member or instructor who—

“(aa) teaches not less than 1 course at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a)), a postsecondary vocational institution (as defined in section 102(c)), or a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b)); and

“(bb) is not employed on a full-time basis by any other employer.”.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1557. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to extend the interest rate limitation on debt entered into during military service to debt incurred during military service to consolidate or refinance student loans incurred before military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1557

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 "Service-member Student Loan Affordability Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. INTEREST RATE LIMITATION ON DEBT ENTERED INTO DURING MILITARY SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE MILITARY SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 207 of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 527) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting "ON DEBT INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE" after "LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

"(2) LIMITATION TO 6 PERCENT ON DEBT INCURRED DURING SERVICE TO CONSOLIDATE OR REFINANCE STUDENT LOANS INCURRED BEFORE SERVICE.—An obligation or liability bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year that is incurred by a servicemember, or the servicemember and the servicemember's spouse jointly, during military service to consolidate or refinance one or more student loans incurred by the servicemember before such military service shall not bear an interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent during the period of military service.";

(4) in paragraph (3), as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection, by inserting "or (2)" after "paragraph (1)"; and

(5) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking "paragraph (2)" and inserting "paragraph (3)".

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "the interest rate limitation in subsection (a)" and inserting "an interest rate limitation in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking "AS OF DATE OF ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY"; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "in the case of an obligation or liability covered by subsection (a)(1), or as of the date the servicemember (or servicemember and spouse jointly) incurs the obligation or liability concerned under subsection (a)(2)".

(c) STUDENT LOAN DEFINED.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) STUDENT LOAN.—The term 'student loan' means the following:

"(A) A Federal student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.).

"(B) A private student loan as that term is defined in section 140(a) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a))."

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1564. A bill to require that employers provide not less than 10 days of paid vacation time to eligible employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about family values. "Family values" is an expression that has been used for many years by my Republican colleagues. Generally speaking, what they mean by "family values" is opposition to a woman's right to choose, opposition to contraception, opposition to gay rights. I happen to strongly disagree with many of my Republican colleagues on those issues. Let me take the opportunity to briefly give a somewhat different per-

spective on family values—on real family values, on the values that really matter to millions of families in this country.

When a mother gives birth to a baby and is unable to spend time with that newborn child during the first weeks and months of that baby's life because she does not have the money to stay home and is forced to go back to work, which is the case for millions of mothers in this country, that is not a family value. Separating a mother from a newborn baby for economic reasons is not a family value. In fact, that is an attack on everything that a family is supposed to stand for.

When a wife is diagnosed with cancer and her husband cannot get time off of work to take care of her because he does not have any family or medical leave time or sick leave time, that is not a family value. That is an attack on everything that a family is supposed to stand for.

When a husband, wife, and kids, during the course of an entire year, are unable to spend any time on a vacation, when they cannot get together in leisure activity, when they cannot relax and spend quality time with each other, that is not a family value.

Let us be very clear in understanding that, in fact, in terms of protecting the needs of our families, in terms of real family values, in many, many respects the United States of America lags behind virtually every other major country on earth.

When you look at other major countries, what you find is that the United States is the only advanced economy that does not guarantee its workers some form of paid family leave, some form of paid sick time, some form of paid vacation time. In other words, when it comes to basic workplace protections and family benefits, workers in every other major industrialized country in the world get a better deal than our workers here in the United States. That is wrong. That is a travesty, and that has got to change.

Last place is no place for America. It is time for us to join the rest of the industrialized world by showing the people of this country that we are not just a nation that talks about family values but that we are a nation that is prepared to live up to these ideals by making sure that workers in this country have access to paid family leave, paid sick time, and paid vacations, just like workers in virtually every other major country on earth.

Simply stated, it is unacceptable that millions of women in this country give birth and are forced back to work because they do not have the income to stay home with their newborn babies.

When we talk about family values, what is more important than for mothers and fathers to bond with their babies at a time when almost every psychologist will tell you those are the most important weeks and months of a human being's life? What kind of family value is it when you tell a woman

who has just had a baby that she cannot spend time with her child because she has to go back to work? This is not a family value. That is an insult to every mother, every father, and every newborn child in this country, and we have to change that.

The reality is that the Family and Medical Leave Act that was signed into law in 1993 is totally inadequate. Today, nearly 8 out of 10 workers in this country who are eligible to take time off under this law cannot do so because they cannot afford to do so, according to the Department of Labor. Even worse, 40 percent of American workers are not even eligible to receive this unpaid leave because they work for a company with fewer than 50 employees.

In my view, every worker in this country should be guaranteed at least 12 weeks of paid family and medical leave, and that is why I am a proud co-sponsor of the FAMILY Act, introduced by KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND. The FAMILY Act would guarantee employees 12 weeks of paid family and medical leave to take care of a baby, to help a family member who is diagnosed with cancer or has some other serious medical condition or to take care of themselves if they become seriously ill. Just like Social Security retirement and disability, it is an insurance program that workers would pay into at a price of about one cup of coffee a week.

That is not all. We have to make certain that in this country workers have paid sick time. It is absurd that low-wage workers in McDonald's and Burger King and low-wage employees all over this country who get sick are forced to work because they cannot afford to take time off. Not only is this unfair to the workers, it is also a public health issue. I do not know about you, but I am not crazy about the idea of somebody who is sick coming to work and preparing the food that I eat in a restaurant.

That is why I am supporting the Healthy Families Act, introduced by Senator PATTY MURRAY, which guarantees 7 days of paid sick leave to American workers. This bill would benefit 43 million Americans who today do not have access to paid sick leave, and it would create a permanent floor in workplaces where employers already provide some paid sick leave.

Last but not least, when we talk about the disappearing American middle class, we are talking about millions of American workers working longer hours for lower wages. We are talking about Americans who are overworked, underpaid and, in many cases, living under enormous stress. In my State of Vermont, I see it every week I am home. You talk to people who work not one job but who are working two jobs or sometimes three jobs in order to cobble together some income and some health care.

Here is an amazing irony. Many of us can remember in school reading about workers protesting, taking to the

streets 100 years ago, and they held up large banners. Do you know what those banners said 100 years ago? They said: We want a 40-hour workweek. A 40-hour workweek was the demand 100 years ago. Today, we still have not achieved that goal.

In fact, today 85 percent of men who are working and 66 percent of working women are working more than 40 hours a week. In fact, in America today—not widely known but true—our people are working the longest hours of any major country on Earth, because as real wages go down, people have to work 50 hours or they have to work 60 hours. Husbands are working here, and wives are working there—all to cobble together some income in order to provide for the family.

Today Americans are working 137 hours a year more than workers in Japan—and the Japanese are very hard workers. We are working 260 hours more than the British and almost 500 hours a year more than French workers.

That is why I am introducing legislation today to require employers to provide at least 10 days of paid vacation to workers in this country. This is already done in almost every other major country on Earth. It is one more way to demonstrate our commitment to real family values. What we are saying is that if families are overworked and if husbands and wives do not even have the time to spend together with their kids, what family values are about is that at least for 2 weeks a year, people can come together under a relaxed environment and enjoy the family. That is a family value that I want to see happen in this country.

The time is long overdue for us to start talking about real family values, not about abortion, not about gay rights but the values the American people want to see inscribed in law to protect their families. Let us make sure every American worker is entitled to paid family and medical leave, paid sick time, and guaranteed at least some vacation time. Those are real family values. Let's go forward and make that happen.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1565. A bill to allow the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to provide greater protection to servicemembers; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, along with Senators SCHUMER, MENENDEZ, WARNER, MERKLEY, WARREN, BLUMENTHAL, FRANKEN, DURBIN, KAINE, and HIRONO, I am introducing the Military Consumer Protection Act, which reinforces our commitment to consumer protections for servicemembers.

Our country has a strong tradition of ensuring that our servicemembers are

protected while they sacrifice to keep our Nation safe. Building on such efforts, Congress passed the Soldiers' and Sailor's Civil Relief Act as World War II escalated to provide crucial financial protections for servicemembers to "enable such persons to devote their entire energy to the defense needs of the Nation." Now called the Servicemember Civil Relief Act, SCRA, this law includes such protections as prohibiting the eviction of servicemembers and their dependents from rental or mortgaged properties and capping the interest at 6 percent on debts incurred prior to an individual entering active duty military service.

Despite the SCRA's importance, enforcement of this critical law has been found to be inconsistent and subject to the discretion of our financial regulators. Indeed, misinformation, lapses, and mistakes that the SCRA was intended to fix continue to persist. Moreover, according to a July 2012 report from the Government Accountability Office, "in 2010, examinations for SCRA compliance occurred in an estimated 26 percent of all [financial] institutions, compared with 2007 when about 4 percent of all institutions were reviewed for SCRA."

Without a change in the law, SCRA enforcement will continue to be subject to the changing priorities of the financial regulators. Simply put, prioritizing the consumer protection of our servicemembers should not be discretionary. It should be mandatory, and my legislation ensures that SCRA enforcement will be a permanent priority for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, which Congress created to enforce Federal consumer financial protection laws.

In 2010, as we were debating the creation of the CFPB, I led the bipartisan effort to ensure it would contain a key role in protecting servicemembers through the establishment of an Office of Servicemember Affairs. Since that time, the CFPB has coordinated with other enforcement agencies and regulators to help servicemembers recover millions in relief from unscrupulous actors in the financial marketplace. With this demonstrated record of success in protecting our servicemembers, the CFPB is an ideal focal point for enforcement of certain key SCRA provisions, such as the protections against default judgments and the maximum rate of interest on debts incurred before military service.

As we take steps to protect our servicemembers, we should do all we can to make sure there is a strong watchdog on the beat that can enforce the protections we have put in place. Our legislation is supported by the National Guard Association of the United States, the National Military Family Association, the Military Officers Association of America, Americans for Financial Reform, the Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Action, the National Consumer Law Center, and the U.S. Public Interest Research

Group. I urge our colleagues to help honor our commitment to our Nation's servicemembers by joining us in this effort to improve the supervision and enforcement of the SCRA.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 199—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL STRATEGIC AGENDA

Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 199

Whereas the United States needs its leaders to pursue policies in the interest of the United States that are foremost national priorities;

Whereas the United States faces many fiscal and long-term policy challenges that not only threaten the opportunities, hopes, and aspirations of the citizens of the United States, but the overall ability of the United States to be a world leader in bringing peace and stability around the world;

Whereas the United States needs its leaders to unite behind common goals and concrete solutions to create the next generation of growth and opportunity;

Whereas a National Strategic Agenda can provide both a long-term vision and a priority list, oriented around common goals for the United States, both of which, as of May 2015, do not exist in the Federal Government;

Whereas adopting a National Strategic Agenda would bring a long-term vision to a policymaking process that has become too often dominated by short-term political considerations;

Whereas a National Strategic Agenda can provide a consistent framework and focus the attention of the Federal Government on the most urgent problems facing the United States;

Whereas millions of people in the United States are currently seeking employment opportunities to improve their lives and provide a better future for their children;

Whereas, as of May 2015, the Federal debt is higher as a percentage of gross domestic product than at any time since World War II and will be an unsustainable burden on future generations if left unaddressed;

Whereas the Social Security and Medicare benefits that millions of people in the United States have earned must be preserved and protected;

Whereas a fiscally responsible solution to secure Social Security and Medicare for future generations is needed now, as waiting longer will further jeopardize the ability to preserve and protect these programs;

Whereas the United States can become energy secure by pursuing an all-of-the-above energy plan that develops more affordable and sustainable domestic energy sources, increases energy efficiency, and builds a more reliable and resilient system for energy generation and transmission; and

Whereas the creation and implementation of a new National Strategic Agenda for the United States will require the participation of both the legislative and executive branch along with agreement by all parties to work together: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the 4 goals of the National Strategic Agenda are to—

(A) create 25,000,000 new jobs over the next 10 years;

(B) balance the Federal budget by 2030;

(C) secure Medicare and Social Security for the next 75 years; and

(D) make the United States energy secure by 2024;

(2) the Senate should strive to create, debate, and adopt policy solutions to achieve the 4 goals of the National Strategic Agenda to address the national interest and priorities represented by the agenda; and

(3) in achieving success toward the National Strategic Agenda, the goal of the Senate should be to reach solutions through—

(A) collaboration, not division;

(B) mutual respect, not partisan bickering; and

(C) a commitment to honor the public duty of the Senate to the United States as a body of representatives elected by people across the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 200—WISHING HIS HOLINESS THE 14TH DALAI LAMA A HAPPY 80TH BIRTHDAY ON JULY 6, 2015, AND RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS HIS HOLINESS HAS MADE TO THE PROMOTION OF NONVIOLENCE, HUMAN RIGHTS, INTERFAITH DIALOGUE, ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS, AND DEMOCRACY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 200

Whereas, for over 50 years, His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama has significantly advanced greater understanding, tolerance, harmony, and respect among the religious faiths of the world;

Whereas the Dalai Lama was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1989 in recognition of his efforts to seek a peaceful resolution to the situation in Tibet and to promote non-violent methods for resolving conflict;

Whereas the Dalai Lama was awarded the Congressional Gold Medal in 2007 in recognition of his many enduring and outstanding contributions to peace, nonviolence, human rights, and religious understanding;

Whereas the Dalai Lama has led the effort to preserve the rich and unique cultural, religious, historical, and linguistic heritage of the people of Tibet while working to safeguard other endangered cultures throughout the world;

Whereas the 14th Dalai Lama has devolved the traditional role of the Dalai Lama as the political head of the Tibetan government, and his own responsibilities within the Central Tibetan Administration, in favor of the democratically elected leadership of Tibetans in exile, while continuing to travel and speak as a spiritual leader for the people of Tibet;

Whereas the Dalai Lama, together with leading environmentalists, has been gravely concerned by the degraded state of the environment of Tibet and the consumption of the natural resources of Tibet, including freshwater, because the degradations have implications not only for the people of Tibet, but for the whole of Asia; and

Whereas the people of the United States, including Tibetan Americans, have come to regard the Dalai Lama as a leading figure of moral and religious authority: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends well-wishes to the Dalai Lama on his 80th birthday;

(2) recognizes the Dalai Lama for a lifelong commitment and outstanding contribution to the promotion of nonviolence, human rights, religious tolerance, environmental awareness, and democracy; and

(3) recognizes the Dalai Lama for using moral authority to promote the concept of universal responsibility as a guiding tenet for how human beings should treat one another and the planet that all human beings share.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1997. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1998. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1999. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2000. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2001. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2002. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2003. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2004. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2005. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1569 proposed by Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2006. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2007. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2008. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2009. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2010. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2011. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WICKER, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2012. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2013. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2014. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2015. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1997. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 236. ASSESSMENT OF EFFECT OF BETTER BUYING POWER 3.0 INITIATIVE ON INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF BETTER BUYING POWER 3.0.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the Better Buying Power 3.0 initiative and its management of independent research and development activities by contractors of the Department of Defense.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the implementation of Better Buying Power 3.0 and how it balances the need for management of reimbursement of Department contractor independent research and development costs with the need to preserve the independence of a contractor to choose which technologies to pursue in its independent research and development program.

(2) An assessment of the costs, risks and benefits of proposed changes to the current guidelines of the Department for authorizing independent research and development by

contractors and reimbursing such contractors for expenses relating to such independent research and development.

(3) Recommendations for legislative or administrative action to improve the ways in which the Department authorizes independent research and development by contractors of the Department and reimburses such contractors for expenses relating to such independent research and development.

SA 1998. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 475, beginning on line 17, strike “2035; and” and all that follows through “(E) Implications” on line 18 and insert the following: “2035;

(D) options to address ship classes that begin decommissioning prior to 2035, including Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruisers; and

(E) implications

SA 1999. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. RETENTION OF RECORDS OF REPRIMANDS AND ADMONISHMENTS RECEIVED BY EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 714. Record of reprimands and admonishments

“If any employee of the Department receives a reprimand or admonishment, the Secretary shall retain a copy of such reprimand or admonishment in the permanent record of the employee as long as the employee is employed by the Department.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“714. Record of reprimands and admonishments.”.

SA 2000. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XVI, add the following:

SEC. 1614. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION MODIFYING RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF ROCKET ENGINES FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION FOR THE EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report if the bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report—

(1) would not authorize appropriations for a fiscal year for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy; and

(2) would modify, amend, or supersede restrictions on the use of rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 2001. Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title V, add the following:

SEC. 524. REVIEW OF CHARACTERIZATION OR TERMS OF DISCHARGE FROM THE ARMED FORCES OF INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL HEALTH DISORDERS ALLEGED TO AFFECT TERMS OF DISCHARGE.

Section 1553(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3)(A) In addition to the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2), in the case of a former member described in subparagraph (B), the board shall—

“(i) review medical evidence of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or a civilian health care provider that is presented by the former member; and

“(ii) review the case with a rebuttable presumption in favor of the former member that post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury materially contributed to the circumstances resulting in the discharge of a lesser characterization.

“(B) A former member described in this subparagraph is a former member described in paragraph (1) or a former member whose application for relief is based in whole or in part on matters relating to post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury as supporting rationale or as justification for priority consideration whose post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury is related to combat or military sexual trauma, as determined by the Secretary concerned.”.

SA 2002. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1273 and insert the following:

SEC. 1273. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORT ON QATAR FIGHTER AIRCRAFT CAPABILITY CONTRIBUTION TO REGIONAL SAFETY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States should consider, in a timely manner, the July 2013 Letter of Request from the Government of Qatar for fighter aircraft;

(2) the approval of such a sale, if found to be in the national interests of the United States, could contribute to the self-defense of Qatar, deter the regional ambitions of Iran, reassure partners and allies of the United States commitment to regional security, and enhance the strike capability of fighter aircraft of the Qatar air force;

(3) the ability of our regional partners to respond to threatening Iranian military actions in the Gulf, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or launching a ballistic missile attack, is a critical element of deterring Iranian aggression and to maintaining security and stability in the region;

(4) the maintenance by Israel of a Qualitative Military Edge (QME) is vital, and due diligence is essential in thoroughly evaluating the impact of such a sale as it relates to the military capabilities of Israel; and

(5) the Department of State should prioritize its consideration of whether to issue a Letter of Offer and Acceptance, to advance the sale of fighter aircraft to the Government of Qatar so that key decisions can be taken regarding the way forward for capabilities that are critical for security and stability in the Middle East.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the risks and benefits of the sale of fighter aircraft to Qatar as described in subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the followings:

(A) A description of the assumptions regarding the increase to Qatar air force capabilities as a result of the sale.

(B) A description of the assumptions regarding items described in subparagraph (A) as they may impact the preservation by Israel of a Qualitative Military Edge.

(C) An estimated timeline for final adjudication of the decision to approve the sale.

(3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) may be submitted in classified or unclassified form.

(4) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SA 2003. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SBIR PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE FEE EXTENSION.

Section 9(mm)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(1)) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “for the 3 fiscal years beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection” and inserting “until September 30, 2017”.

SA 2004. Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1084. SENSE OF SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE AIR FORCE MINORITY LEADERS PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Air Force Minority Leaders Program facilitates the development of relationships between the Department of the Air Force and students, teachers, and professors from historically black colleges and universities and minority institutions (HBCU/MI) to contribute to the performance of research tasks for the Department.

(2) The Air Force Minority Leaders Program promotes valuable research for the Department, increases the pipeline of minority scientific talent for professions within the Air Force, and strengthens the scientific and educational infrastructure in the minority community.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate to encourage the Department of the Air Force and the Air Force Research Laboratory to continue to invest in the Air Force Minority Leaders Program by devoting time, personnel, and resources to the Program in order to meet the critical objectives of the Department with respect to defense capabilities, science and technology, the future workforce, and other technical matters.

SA 2005. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1569 proposed by Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) to the amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe

military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 29, strike line 9 and insert the following:

authority regarding a cybersecurity threat; and

(iii) communications between a Federal law enforcement entity and a private entity regarding a cybersecurity threat;

SA 2006. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ON TRAVEL OF NEXT OF KIN TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DIGNIFIED TRANSFER OF REMAINS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WHO DIE OVERSEAS.

(a) REVIEW OF POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a review of the current policies of the Department of Defense on the travel for next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The review required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the changes to Department instructions and Federal regulations necessary to provide Government funded travel to the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurred in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(B) An action plan and timeline for making the changes described in subparagraph (A).

(b) MODIFICATION OF POLICIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to modify the policies of the Department in order to provide Government funded travel for the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurs in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary is not required to modify the policies of the Department as described in paragraph (1) if, by not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary certifies, in writing, to the congressional defense committees that such action is not in the best interest of the United States. The certification shall include the following:

(A) An assessment and reevaluation by the Secretary of the rationale for excluding the next of kin from Government funded travel if the death of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the Department overseas occurs in a non-combat area.

(B) Recommendations for alternative plans to ensure that the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of

the Department who die overseas in a non-combat area may participate in the dignified transfer of the remains of the deceased at Dover Port Mortuary, including through the actions of appropriate non-governmental organizations.

SA 2007. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION.

(a) EXTENSION OF COMMISSION.—Section 679 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1795), as amended by section 1095(b)(6) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 880), is further amended by striking “not later than 35 months after the Commission establishment date” and inserting “on October 1, 2016”.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 680 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (126 Stat. 1795), as amended by section 1095(b)(7) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (127 Stat. 880), is further amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “Of the amounts”;

(2) in the third sentence, by striking “under this section” and inserting “under this subsection”; and

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

“(b) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, \$1,800,000 shall be made available to the Commission to carry out its duties under this subtitle. Funds made available to the Commission under the preceding sentence shall remain available until expended.”

SA 2008. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1645 and insert the following:

SEC. 1645. ISRAELI COOPERATIVE MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM CODEVELOPMENT AND POTENTIAL COPRODUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, of the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for Procurement, Defense-wide, and available for the Missile Defense Agency, \$150,000,000 may be provided to the Government of Israel to procure the David’s Sling Weapon System

and \$15,000,000 for the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program, including for co-production of parts and components in the United States by United States industry.

(b) DISBURSEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), following successful completion of milestones that inform production decisions and production readiness reviews in the research, development, and technology agreements for the David's Sling Weapon System and the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Development Program, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency may disburse amounts available pursuant to subsection (a) on the basis of what is mutually agreed to by the United States and Israel, on or after the date that the United States enters into a bilateral agreement with the Government of Israel that, as determined by the Director, accomplishes the following:

(A) Establishes the terms of co-production of parts and components of the respective systems—

(i) in a manner that will minimize non-occurring engineering and facilitation expenses; and

(ii) that ensures that an optimal production share is carried out by United States persons.

(B) Ensures that, in the case of coproduction of the David's Sling Weapon System, a study is jointly conducted by the Israel Missile Defense Organization and the Missile Defense Agency of the United States as follows:

(i) The purpose of the study shall be to determine the most effective and efficient ways to reach a target of 50 percent production in the United States by the end of the multi-year coproduction plan.

(ii) The study shall identify and assess, with respect to the process of moving production to the United States—

(I) the best opportunities for United States contractors;

(II) cost, schedule, and operational risks; and

(III) imports required.

(iii) The study shall be carried out so that the results will inform future negotiations on the amendments to the bilateral agreement with regard to United States work share.

(C) Establishes a plan for procurement, using amounts disbursed under this subsection and based on the Israeli requirement for the number of interceptors and batteries of the respective systems that will be procured.

(D) Allows the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to establish technical milestones for coproduction and procurement of the respective systems.

(E) Establishes joint approval processes for third party sales of such systems.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR LONG LEAD TIME AND CRITICAL ITEMS.—(A) The Director may make a disbursement under paragraph (1) before the date that the United States enters into a bilateral agreement described in such paragraph for long lead time and critical procurement items and activities, not to exceed \$90,000,000 for the David's Sling Weapon System and \$15,000,000 for the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor Program.

(B) Amounts disbursed under subparagraph (A) shall be considered amounts disbursed under a bilateral agreement described in paragraph (1).

SA 2009. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016

for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XIV, add the following:

SEC. 1409. ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS, WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS, FOR THE DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 1401 is hereby increased by \$322,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for working capital funds, Defense Commissary Agency, as specified in the funding table in section 4501.

(b) OFFSET.—

(1) O&M, ARMY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 is hereby decreased by \$53,666,667, with the amount of the decrease to be applied to amounts available for operation and maintenance, Army, as specified in the funding table in section 4301 and achieved by limiting excessive and redundant purchases of spare parts.

(2) O&M, NAVY.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 is hereby decreased by \$53,666,667, with the amount of the decrease to be applied to amounts available for operation and maintenance, Navy, as specified in the funding table in section 4301 and achieved by limiting excessive and redundant purchases of spare parts.

(3) O&M, AIR FORCE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 by section 301 is hereby decreased by \$53,666,666, with the amount of the decrease to be applied to amounts available for operation and maintenance, Air Force, as specified in the funding table in section 4301 and achieved by limiting excessive and redundant purchases of spare parts.

(4) GENERALLY.—The aggregate amount available for fiscal year 2016 under this division due to foreign currency fluctuations is reduced from the aggregate amount otherwise specified in the funding tables in division D by \$151,000,000.

SA 2010. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. REPORT ON DEFENSE CONTRACTING FRAUD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on defense contracting fraud.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A summary of fraud-related criminal convictions and civil judgements or settlements over the previous five fiscal years.

(2) A listing of contractors that within the previous five fiscal years performed con-

tracts for the Department of Defense and were debarred or suspended from Federal contracting based on a criminal conviction for fraud.

(3) An assessment of the total value of Department of Defense contracts entered into during the previous five fiscal years with contractors that have been indicted for, settled charges of, been fined by any Federal department or agency for, or been convicted of fraud in connection with any contract or other transaction entered into with the Federal Government.

(4) Recommendations by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense or other appropriate Department of Defense official regarding how to penalize contractors repeatedly involved in fraud in connection with contracts or other transactions entered into with the Federal Government, including an update on implementation by the Department of any previous such recommendations.

SA 2011. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WICKER, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 1272 and insert the following:

SEC. 1272. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ANTI-TUNNEL COOPERATION.

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

(1) Tunnels can be used for criminal purposes, such as smuggling drugs, weapons, or humans, or for terrorist or military purposes, such as launching surprise attacks or detonating explosives underneath civilian or military infrastructure.

(2) Tunnels have been a growing threat on the southern border of the United States for years.

(3) In the conflict in Gaza in 2014, terrorists used tunnels to conduct attacks against Israel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to develop technology to detect and counter tunnels, and the best way to do this is to partner with other affected countries;

(2) the Administration should, on a joint basis with Israel, carry out research, development, test, and evaluation of anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel; and

(3) the Administration should use developed anti-tunnel capabilities to better protect the United States and deployed United States military personnel.

(c) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH ANTI-TUNNEL CAPABILITIES PROGRAM WITH ISRAEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel and in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, is authorized to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation, on a joint

basis with Israel, to establish anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel. Such authority includes authority to construct facilities and install equipment necessary to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation so authorized. Any activities carried out pursuant to such authority shall be conducted in a manner that appropriately protects sensitive information and United States and Israel national security interests.

(2) **REPORT.**—The activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (d) may be carried out after the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth the following:

(A) A memorandum of agreement between the United States and Israel regarding sharing of research and development costs for the capabilities described in paragraph (1), and any supporting documents.

(B) A certification that the memorandum of agreement—

(i) requires sharing of costs of projects, including in-kind support, between the United States and Israel;

(ii) establishes a framework to negotiate the rights to any intellectual property developed under the memorandum of agreement; and

(iii) requires the United States Government to receive quarterly reports on expenditure of funds, if any, by the Government of Israel, including a description of what the funds have been used for, when funds were expended, and an identification of entities that expended the funds.

(d) **ASSISTANCE IN CONNECTION WITH PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide procurement, maintenance, and sustainment assistance to Israel in support of the anti-tunnel capabilities research, development, test, and evaluation activities authorized in subsection (c)(1).

(2) **REPORT.**—Assistance may not be provided under paragraph (1) until 15 days after the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth a detailed description of the assistance to be provided.

(3) **MATCHING CONTRIBUTION.**—Assistance may not be provided under this subsection unless the Government of Israel contributes an amount not less than the amount of assistance to be so provided to the program, project, or activity for which the assistance is to be so provided.

(e) **QUARTERLY REPORTS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress on a quarterly basis a report that contains a copy of the most recent quarterly report provided by the Government of Israel to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)(iii).

(f) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(g) **SUNSET.**—The authority in this section to carry out activities described in subsection (c), and to provide assistance described in subsection (d), shall expire on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2012. Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. BORDER SECURITY ON FEDERAL LANDS ALONG THE SOUTHERN BORDER.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FEDERAL LANDS.**—The term “Federal lands” includes all land under the control of the Secretary concerned that is located—

(A) within 100 miles of the international border between the United States and Mexico; and

(B) within the Tucson and Yuma sectors of United States Border Patrol.

(2) **SECRETARY CONCERNED.**—The term “Secretary concerned” means—

(A) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture; and

(B) with respect to land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) **SUPPORT FOR BORDER SECURITY NEEDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—To achieve border security on Federal lands—

(A) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary concerned shall provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel with immediate access to Federal lands for border security activities, including—

(i) routine motorized patrols; and

(ii) the deployment of communications, surveillance, and detection equipment;

(B) the Secretary concerned may provide education and training to U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel on the natural and cultural resources present on individual Federal land units; and

(C) the security activities described in subparagraph (A) shall be conducted, to the maximum extent practicable, in a manner that the Secretary of Homeland Security determines will best protect the natural and cultural resources on Federal lands.

(2) **INTERMINGLED STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any private or State-owned land within the boundaries of Federal lands.

(3) **SUNSET.**—The requirements under this subsection shall terminate on the date that is 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days before the date on which the requirements under subsection (b) are scheduled to terminate, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes—

(1) an analysis of the effectiveness of the actions taken pursuant to such subsection, including the impact of such actions on—

(A) border security activities; and

(B) the natural and cultural resources on impacted Federal lands;

(2) an assessment of the 2006 Memos of Understanding between the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior regarding access to Federal and Indian lands for border security activities, including—

(A) how such memoranda, as in force on the date of the enactment of this Act, impacted border security activities;

(B) the best way to improve such memoranda and their application;

(C) specific ways in which such memoranda could be used to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security receives timely access to Federal lands for critical border security activities; and

(D) the number of agency personnel required to effectively and efficiently execute such memoranda;

(3) a sector-by-sector analysis of the expected impact of applying the requirements under subsection (b) to the entire land border of the United States, including—

(A) an assessment of—

(i) how border security activities and natural, cultural, and historic resources on Federal and Indian lands would be impacted, including the potential impact on wildlife, including endangered species;

(ii) any actions the Department of Homeland Security would need to take to mitigate the impact of border security activities, including the estimated costs of such actions; and

(iii) whether lack of access hinders border security; and

(B) an examination of the impact of providing the Department of Homeland Security with increased access to Federal and Indian lands located within—

(i) 25 miles of the United States border;

(ii) 50 miles of the United States border; or

(iii) 100 miles of the United States border;

and

(4) a sector-by-sector analysis of—

(A) the costs incurred by each Secretary concerned relating to managing and mitigating for illegal border activity on Federal lands, including the cost of restoring natural resources that were damaged by illegal border activity;

(B) the impact of illegal traffic on wildlife, including endangered species and critical habitat; and

(C) the impact of illegal traffic on natural, cultural, and historic resources on Federal lands.

SA 2013. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO USED POST-9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO PURSUE A PROGRAM OF EDUCATION AT AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING THAT CLOSED WHILE PURSUING THE PROGRAM.

(a) **ASSISTANCE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter II of chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3318 the following new section:

“§3318A. Assistance for individuals who pursue programs of education at institutions of higher learning that unexpectedly close

“(a) **COVERED INDIVIDUALS.**—(1) For purposes of this section, a covered individual is any individual who—

“(A)(i) pursued a program of education at an institution of higher learning with educational assistance under this chapter and stopped pursuing such program of education

because the institution of higher learning closed before such individual could complete such program of education or because the individual anticipated that such institution of higher learning would close and withdrew from such program not more than 120 days before the date on which such institution of higher learning actually closed; and

“(ii) did not complete such program of education pursuant to a teach-out plan (as defined in section 487(f)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(f)(2))); or

“(B) pursued a program of education with educational assistance under this chapter at an institution of higher learning that the Secretary determines caused such harm to the individual as the Secretary determines equity requires that the individual receive relief under this section.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection and in the case of the closing of an institution of higher learning, the Secretary may increase the 120-day period specified in paragraph (1)(A)(i) if the Secretary determines that exceptional circumstances regarding such closing justify the increase.

“(b) RESTORATION OF ENTITLEMENT TO EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall restore to each covered individual who used educational assistance under this chapter to pursue a program of education at an institution of higher learning—

“(1) as described in subparagraph (A) of subsection (a)(1) such individual’s entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter in an amount equal to one month for each month of educational assistance used by the individual to pursue such program of education at such institution of higher learning; and

“(2) as described in subparagraph (B) of such subsection such individual’s entitlement to educational assistance under this chapter in such amount as the Secretary determines equity requires.

“(c) RESTORATION OF ENTITLEMENT TO TUTORIAL ASSISTANCE.—In the case of a covered individual described in subsection (a)(1) who received benefits under section 3314 of this title to correct a deficiency of the covered individual in a course that was part of the program of education pursued by the covered individual as described in such subsection, the Secretary shall—

“(1) in a case described in subparagraph (A) of such subsection, restore to such covered individual such covered individual’s entitlement to benefits under such section in an amount equal to the amount paid under such section for such correction; and

“(2) in a case described in subparagraph (B) of such subsection, restore to such covered individual such amount of such covered individual’s entitlement to benefits under such section as the Secretary determines equity requires.

“(d) CONTINUED PAYMENT OF MONTHLY HOUSING STIPENDS.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), in the case of a covered individual described in subsection (a)(1) who in the case described in subparagraph (A) of such subsection was receiving a monthly housing stipend under this chapter while pursuing the program of education at the institution of higher learning that closed or who in a case described in subparagraph (B) of such subsection in which the covered individual was receiving a monthly housing stipend under this chapter while pursuing the program of education and stopped pursuing the program of education because of the harm caused by the institution of higher learning, the Secretary shall continue to pay to such covered individual such monthly housing stipend for the first month beginning after the covered individual stopped pursuing such program of education and for each month thereafter until the covered individual begins pursuing

a program of education at a new institution of higher learning with educational assistance under this chapter.

“(2) No individual may receive more than three months of monthly stipend under this subsection.

“(e) NATIONAL TESTS.—In the case of a covered individual who pursued a program of education at an institution of higher education as described in subsection (a)(1) and received educational assistance under section 3315A of this title for a national test for admission to such program of education or institution of higher learning or for course credit at such institution of higher learning, the Secretary shall restore to such covered individual the months of entitlement charged such covered individual pursuant to subsection (c) of such section for such educational assistance.

“(f) RELOCATION AND TRAVEL ASSISTANCE.—A payment under section 3318 of this title for pursuit of a program of education at an institution of higher learning as described in subsection (a)(1) of this section shall not be considered a payment of additional assistance under section 3318 of this title for purposes of subsection (d) of such section.

“(g) RECOVERY.—In a case of a covered individual who pursued a program of education at an institution of higher learning as described in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall seek to recover from the institution of higher learning the value of—

“(1) the entitlement to educational assistance restored to the covered individual under subsections (b) and (e), if any;

“(2) the entitlement to tutorial assistance restored to the covered individual under subsection (c), if any;

“(3) the amount of monthly housing stipend paid to the covered individual under subsection (d)(1), if any; and

“(4) the additional assistance provided to the covered individual under section 3318 of this title for such pursuit, if any.

“(h) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘institution of higher learning’ has the meaning given that term in section 3452 of this title.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 33 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3318 the following new item:

“3318A. Assistance for individuals who pursue programs of education at institutions of higher learning that unexpectedly close.”

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in section 3318A of such title, as added by subsection (a)(1), or any other provision of law, shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from restoring entitlement or continuing payment under such section before promulgating regulations to carry out such section.

(c) RETROACTIVE EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 3318A of such title, as added by subsection (a), shall apply as if it were enacted on the date of the enactment of the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-252).

SA 2014. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1049. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FURTHER CUTS TO THE NUMBER OF BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS OF THE ARMY.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) both the quantity and complexity of national security threats facing the United States have grown in recent years, particularly the threat posed by the terrorists of the self-declared Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and continuing aggression by the Russian Federation;

(2) the National Commission on the Future of the Army is currently assessing the appropriate force structure for the Army in light of these threats, and is required to report to Congress on that assessment by February 1, 2016; and

(3) in light of these growing threats and that assessment, the Department of Defense should not make further reductions in the number of brigade combat teams in the regular and reserve components of the Army, including the Army National Guard, which would be difficult and costly to reverse and would have an adverse impact on the ability of the Army to respond to global threats.

SA 2015. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1463 proposed by Mr. MCCAIN to the bill H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 832. APPLICABILITY OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 13673 “FAIR PAY AND SAFE WORKPLACES” TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS.

(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall limit the application of any acquisition regulations promulgated pursuant to Executive Order 13673 to contractors or subcontractors who have been suspended or debarred under the laws and regulations in effect on May 28, 2015, as a result of a Federal labor law violations covered by Executive Order 13673.

(b) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that Department of Defense contractors or subcontractors who are not described under subsection (a) are not compelled or required to comply with the conditions for contracting eligibility as stated in any acquisition regulations promulgated to implement Executive Order 13673.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on June 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Achieving the Promise of Health Information Technology: What Can Providers and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Do To Improve the Electronic Health Record User Experience?”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jamie

Garden of the committee staff on (202) 224-1409.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR,
AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on June 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Evaluating Accreditation's Role in Ensuring Quality."

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jake Baker of the committee staff on (202) 224-0738.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC
WORKS

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 11, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 11, 2015, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Blowing the Whistle on Retaliation: Accounts of Current and Former Federal Agency Whistleblowers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 11, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ryan Nagle, my State director, be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO EXTEND THE AUTHORIZATION
TO CARRY OUT THE REPLACE-
MENT OF THE EXISTING MED-
ICAL CENTER OF THE DEPART-
MENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS IN
DENVER, COLORADO

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consider-

ation of S. 1568, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1568) to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I thank Chairman ISAKSON of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for his tireless work on this legislation and Senator BLUMENTHAL as well as the co-sponsor of this legislation tonight, Senator BENNET, my colleague from Colorado.

This gives us the breathing room we need to finish the job in Colorado. We have more work to do with the Veterans' Administration, but tonight we can begin the process of starting to finish this job.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1568) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1568

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED.

Section 2(a) of the Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act (Public Law 114-19) is amended—

- (1) by striking "in fiscal year 2015,"; and
- (2) by striking "\$900,000,000" and inserting "\$1,050,000,000".

SEC. 2. LIMITED, ONE-TIME AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER SPECIFIC AMOUNTS TO CARRY OUT MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECT IN DENVER, COLORADO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the unobligated balances of amounts available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2015, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may transfer amounts from the appropriations accounts under the following headings, in the amounts and from the activities specified, to the appropriations account under the heading "Construction, Major Projects":

- (1) "Medical Services", \$6,494,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (2) "Medical Support and Compliance", \$1,611,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (3) "Medical Facilities", \$80,735,000 to be derived from amounts available for green energy projects of the Department and human capital investment plans.
- (4) "National Cemetery Administration", \$60,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.
- (5) "General Administration", \$1,130,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Office of the Secretary.
- (6) "General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration", \$670,000 to be de-

rived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.

(7) "Information Technology Systems", \$240,000 to be derived from amounts available for the Human Capital Investment Plan.

(8) "Construction, Minor Projects", \$3,000,000 to be derived from amounts available for minor construction projects at the staff offices of the Department.

(b) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS AVAILABLE IN FUNDS.—

(1) REVOLVING SUPPLY FUND.—Of the unobligated balances of amounts available in the revolving supply fund of the Department under section 8121 of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary may transfer \$20,030,000 to the appropriations account under the heading "Construction, Major Projects".

(2) FRANCHISE FUND.—Of the unobligated balances of amounts available in the Department of Veterans Affairs Franchise Fund established in title I of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104-204; 31 U.S.C. 501 note), the Secretary may transfer \$36,030,000 to the appropriations account under the heading "Construction, Major Projects".

(c) USE OF AMOUNTS AND AVAILABILITY.—The amounts transferred under subsections (a) and (b) shall—

- (1) be used only to carry out the major medical facility construction project in Denver, Colorado, specified in section 2 of the Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act (Public Law 114-19); and
- (2) remain available until September 30, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 95, H.R. 615.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 615) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

H.R. 615

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act" or the "DHS Interoperable Communications Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

- (1) the term "Department" means the Department of Homeland Security;
- (2) the term "interoperable communications" has the meaning given that term in section 701(d) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 3; and
- (3) the term "Under Secretary for Management" means the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. INCLUSION OF INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES IN RESPONSIBILITIES OF UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT.

Section 701 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, including policies and directives to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components of the Department”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘interoperable communications’ has the meaning given that term in section 7303(g) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (6 U.S.C. 194(g)).”.

SEC. 4. STRATEGY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a strategy, which shall be updated as necessary, for achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department, including for daily operations, planned events, and emergencies, with corresponding milestones, that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of interoperability gaps in radio communications among the components of the Department, as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Information on efforts and activities, including current and planned policies, directives, and training, of the Department since November 1, 2012 to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components of the Department, and planned efforts and activities of the Department to achieve and maintain such interoperable communications.

(3) An assessment of obstacles and challenges to achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department.

(4) Information on, and an assessment of, the adequacy of mechanisms available to the Under Secretary for Management to enforce and compel compliance with interoperable communications policies and directives of the Department.

(5) Guidance provided to the components of the Department to implement interoperable communications policies and directives of the Department.

(6) The total amount of funds expended by the Department since November 1, 2012 and projected future expenditures, to achieve interoperable communications, including on equipment, infrastructure, and maintenance.

(7) Dates upon which Department-wide interoperability is projected to be achieved for voice, data, and video communications, respectively, and interim milestones that correspond to the achievement of each such mode of communication.

(b) **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL.**—Together with the strategy required under subsection (a), the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate information on—

(1) any intra-agency effort or task force that has been delegated certain responsibilities by the Under Secretary for Management relating to achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department by the dates referred to in subsection (a)(7); and

(2) who, within each such component, is responsible for implementing policies and directives issued by the Under Secretary for Management to so achieve and maintain such interoperable communications.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 100 days after the date on which the strategy required under section 4(a) is submitted, and every 2 years thereafter for 6 years, the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the status of efforts to implement the strategy required under section 4(a), including the following:

(1) Progress on each interim milestone referred to in section 4(a)(7) toward achieving and maintaining interoperable communications among the components of the Department.

(2) Information on any policies, directives, guidance, and training established by the Under Secretary for Management.

(3) An assessment of the level of compliance, adoption, and participation among the components of the Department with the policies, directives, guidance, and training established by the Under Secretary for Management to achieve and maintain interoperable communications among the components.

(4) Information on any additional resources or authorities needed by the Under Secretary for Management.

SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY.

Sections 4 and 5 shall only apply with respect to the interoperable communications capabilities within the Department and components of the Department to communicate within the Department.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 615), as amended, was passed.

AUTHORIZING THE REPRINTING OF THE 25TH EDITION OF THE POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 54, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) authorizing the reprinting of the 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) was agreed to.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Georgia be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, June 15, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to Executive Session to the en bloc consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 131 and 132; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that following disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2015

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, June 15; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1735; and, finally, the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to both H.R. 1735 and the McCain substitute 1463 be at 4 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:19 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 15, 2015, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

CONFIRMATION

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY, VICE STANLEY R. CHESLER, RETIRING.
ROBERT F. ROSSITER, JR., OF NEBRASKA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA, VICE JOSEPH F. BATAILLON, RETIRED.

Executive nomination confirmed by
the Senate June 11, 2015:

DOUGLAS J. KRAMER, OF KANSAS, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE 2015 ARMED FORCES ENLISTEES FROM FREDERICKSBURG, VA

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 105 Fredericksburg, Virginia area high school seniors who plan to enlist in the United States Armed Forces after graduation. These students have excelled in their academic and extracurricular activities, and I offer my sincere congratulations upon their high school graduation.

I commend these student leaders for their selflessness and courageous decision to serve their country as members of the Armed Forces:

Amaya, Alexis Perez; Anderson, Jamie; Bates, Devon; Black, Sean; Blosch, Charles; Coleman, Jaylan; Courtney, James; Cunningham, Christopher; Denise, Sean; Dixon, Tyler; Harcrow, Derek; Hardy, Diamond; Hughes, Hayden; Jenkins, Hunter; Lawrence, Darell; Lintz, Christopher; Lloyd, Katelyn; McHugh, Michael; Minaya, Jonathan; O'Carroll, Alexander; Pladson, Tyler; Post, Seth; Prouty, Justin; Rafferty, Sean; Rivas, Michael; Shannon, Danielle; Smith, Jared; Smith, Justin; Steele, Brian; Stemen, Austein; Thomas, Sabre; Thornton, Destiny; Toussaint, Jamel; Wilson, Ashley; Yingling, Christopher.

Allen, Joshua; Bass, Elijah; Beard, Justin; Becerra, Luis; Bentz, Asher; Carter, Brandon; Clatterbuck, Zachary; Deleon, Elias; Dirisio, Daniel; Farr, Austin; Freeborn, Harley; Heath, Christopher; Holland, Elizabeth; Humberger, Jacob; Jenkins, Adam; Johnson, Nathaniel; Keirn, Ryan; Lewellyn, Benjamin; Mason, Garrett; McNair, Nicholas; Medinafranco, Tomas; Meyers, Tyler; Morris, Austin; Peck, Joshua; Perkins, Andrew; Phoebus, Scott; Pins, Jonathon; Principe, Leilani; Rigopoulos, Nicholas; Robleroyoc, Gerardo; Seggelink, Jacob; Shingler, Jonathan; Smith, David; Snider, James; Thome, Dominic; Torres, Everett; Vitale, Logan; Woodall, Mason.

Archer, Robert; Archie, Torrance; Belcher, Joshua; Dale, John Barron; Dillahunt, Zakiya; Duff, Cody; Flecker, Arthur; Gines, Dwayne; Glass, Samuel; Leach, Hunter; Moss, Shaygne; Norris, Seth; Smith, Jamie Le Ann; Tillmon, Sarah; Tran, Robinson; Truffer, Steven; Warren, Adam; Waters, Deja; Williams, Aaron.

Berry, Katie; Christensen-Dinwiddie, Joseph; Eldridge, Amber; Edivan, Joseph; Gilbert, Ryan; Harris, Brian; Kenly, Logan; Nordgren, Tycho; Rousseau, Teagan; Smith, Kayla; Szczepanski, Brittany; Valvo, Anthony; Wilkins, Kendrick.

These students will be honored by the Greater Fredericksburg Chapter of Our Community Salutes at their 4th Annual Military Enlistee Recognition Ceremony on Saturday, June 20, 2015 at the University of Mary Washington in Fredericksburg, VA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking these young men and women and their families for their dedication to serving this great Nation. We owe them and the many Americans who have served and will serve a debt of gratitude.

HONORING GRAHAM BOONE

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Graham Boone who has achieved the Eagle Scout award, a Boy Scout's highest honor. This recognition is well deserved and represents this young man's commitment to public service.

Achieving the status of Eagle Scout is a huge accomplishment, and I commend Mr. Boone for being a positive role model to young people across our great state and the nation through his commitment to community service.

Once again, congratulations to this young man for his outstanding accomplishment. I am very proud of him and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF
BENJAMIN BLYTHEWOOD III

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fine man and a friend, Benjamin Blythewood III. Ben passed away on Monday, June 1, 2015, at the age of 48.

Ben led an exemplary life that was dedicated to serving his community. As mayor of Woodville for six and a half years, a reliable member of our local Lion's Club, as well as that of countless other community organizations, Ben lived an inspiring life that was focused on helping and caring for others. Ben was also a proud Christian and a faithful member of the First Baptist Church of Woodville.

My prayers and condolences go out to Ben's loving wife, Amy, his son Benjamin and his daughter Bryanna. Ben will be sorely missed in our community, but his passion and legacy will certainly live on.

HONORING MR. NICK GWIAZDOWSKI FOR HIS OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT DURING THE 2014-15 NCAA DIVISION I WRESTLING SEASON

HON. DAVID ROUZER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, as a North Carolina State University alumnus, it is my pleasure to rise today to congratulate Nick Gwiazdowski on his 2015 NCAA Division I Individual National Championship. He defended his 2014 National Championship and is the first Wolfpack wrestler to win back-to-back titles.

Mr. Gwiazdowski has quickly established himself as one of the most successful student-athletes in NC State history. His perfect 2014-15 season, 35-0, has led to a 55-match winning streak, the longest in the nation entering next season. He is a three-time All-American and two-time ACC Wrestler of the Year.

Entering his senior year, Mr. Gwiazdowski holds a 77-2 record with the Pack and is on pace to set the NC State record for win-loss percentage. More importantly, Mr. Gwiazdowski is the H.C. Kennett Award Winner, presented annually to NC State's top student-athlete and was named to the 2015 All-ACC Academic Team.

Congratulations again, Nick. Wolfpack fans everywhere are proud of you and look forward to your continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT
OF FAYE PERKINS

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of the coaching career of Faye Perkins, UW-River Falls Falcon softball coach. After 22 seasons, Coach Perkins retired at the end of the 2015 spring season.

During her tenure at UW-River Falls, Coach Perkins received numerous awards and accolades. She won more games than any other head coach in the history of UW-River Falls. Under her leadership, the UW-River Falls Falcons won Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (WIAC) Championships in 1993, 1994 and a Playoff Championship in 1993, 1994 and 2012. The 2012 team had a school record 34 wins and finished just one win away from reaching the NCAA Division III final eight Championship series. She was named the WIAC Coach of the Year in 1996 and had over 500 total career wins.

Faye was raised in Cresco, Iowa. She is a proponent of Title IX and has spoken on the benefits she experienced from this landmark legislation. While in high school, she petitioned

• 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.

to have a girls' basketball team for the first time. She went to Iowa State University, where she received a Bachelor of Science in Physical Education and a Master of Science in Exercise Physiology. While in college, she earned nine athletic letters as a member of the softball, basketball and track & field programs. In 2004, Faye was inducted into the Iowa State University Athletic Hall of Fame. She completed her Ph.D. in Health Education from the University of Utah.

While she is proud of the records established by the UW–River Falls Softball program, she is most proud of working with the students. Dedicated, passionate and supportive are just three of many adjectives used to describe Coach Perkins. In addition to coaching, Faye Perkins was the interim dean from 2007–2011 for the UW–River Falls College of Education and Professional Studies.

She has a passion not only for coaching and teaching, but also of traveling. Faye, her husband Joe, and their sons, Paul and Bobby, have enjoyed traveling the world. She has had the opportunity to teach in China and Scotland. She will continue teaching at UW–River Falls where she will remain the chair of the Health and Human Performance Department.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF
REVEREND DR. RICHARD LIN

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of my constituent Anita Lin's loving father Reverend Dr. Richard Lin. Anita currently presides as the director emeritus of Ballet Western Reserve in Youngstown, Ohio and was appointed by the White House in 2014 to serve as a member of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts' advisory committee. Her dear father Dr. Lin passed away peacefully on May 21 in Santa Rosa, California. Dr. Lin was highly regarded within the community for his devotion to the performing arts and the teaching of music.

Born in Hunan Province, China in 1925 to humble beginnings, Richard Lin immigrated to the United States in 1952. Richard was very successful in his schooling having studied voice at the National Conservatory of Music in Shanghai before earning an undergraduate degree from the National Conservatory of Music in Paris. After performing in concert tours nationally and internationally, Richard went on to teach at the Oklahoma Baptist University for twelve years as a professor of music and chairman of the voice department before co-founding the Chinese Christian Church Music Institute for Worship. In addition, Dr. Lin was a senior professor of church music at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary where he touched the lives of thousands of church musicians. His achievements in teaching were recognized by the Association of Voice Teachers and American Choral Directors Association.

Dr. Lin is survived by his loving wife, Julia See Ying Lam Lin, with whom he shared sixty-five wonderful years. He also leaves behind his four children, eight grandchildren, and a great-granddaughter. I am deeply saddened

by the passing of Reverend Dr. Richard Lin and I would like to extend my deepest condolences to his entire family. He was a great man whose legacy will continue to live on, and he will be missed.

COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF
ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. AUSTIN SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes:

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act.

I firmly believe this legislation represents the kind of thoughtful and bipartisan approach to policy-making that is often lacking in Washington.

It represents simple good governance by reauthorizing the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, which has been operating without authorization since 2013.

The bill includes needed reforms to clarify Congressional intent, minimize regulatory burdens, and most importantly, preserve the ability of necessary risk management markets to serve those who need them.

The Agriculture Committee, specifically the Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit of which I serve as Chairman, heard diverse perspectives from end-users, market participants, and regulators through many hours of testimony on this reauthorization earlier this year.

That testimony, coupled with testimony from numerous other hearings at the subcommittee and full committee level over the course of the last two Congresses, was instrumental in drafting the legislation before us today.

Time and again, we have heard how end-users, who were not the cause of the financial crisis, have been the collateral damage of Dodd-Frank's reforms. These end-users are our farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and electric and gas utilities, and they rely on the derivatives markets to manage their risk, and, thereby keep consumer costs low.

The cost of unnecessary regulatory burdens on these end-users, and the uncertainty these regulations cause, will ultimately be borne by American citizens in my district and in districts around the country. Therefore, it is essential that we provide them with much-needed relief and clarity.

This legislation includes several such end-user relief provisions. It requires the Commission to vote to change the current threshold for the swap dealer de minimis exception, rather than the automatic and arbitrary reduction slated to occur in December 2017.

It also preserves end users' ability to hedge against anticipated business risks under the definition of a bona fide hedge transaction,

provides common sense record-keeping relief for grain elevators, farmers, and other commercial market participants, and clarifies the exclusion of contracts with volumetric optionality from the definition of a swap.

Additionally, this legislation codifies several new regulatory customer protections, borne out of lessons learned from the Peregrine Financial and MF Global failures.

Finally, it makes important reforms to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, including the creation of a new Office of the Chief Economist and a more stringent requirement for cost benefit analysis of proposed rules.

With this legislation, we have the opportunity to ease the regulatory burden on those who use the derivatives markets, not to speculate, but to hedge risk. Ultimately, this bill is about protecting the American producer and the American consumer.

I want to close by thanking Chairman CONAWAY for his strong leadership on the House Committee on Agriculture. His thoughtful and bipartisan approach to policy-making is reflected in the legislation before us today.

Additionally, I want to thank the Ranking Member on the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee and my colleague from Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT, who has been a steady partner throughout this effort.

We have worked diligently to produce legislation that provides needed reforms to ensure our regulatory framework protects the integrity of our markets while not limiting the ability of end users to access these tools to conduct their business.

I am proud to support H.R. 2289, the Commodity End-User Relief Act, and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this legislation.

COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF
ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. TED S. YOHO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2289) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes:

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chair, I rise in full support of H.R. 2289—The Commodity End-User Relief Act—and thank Chairman CONAWAY for his leadership on this issue. Mr. Chair, H.R. 2289 brings needed regulatory relief to farmers, ranchers, and individuals across rural America.

In my district, agriculture is the single largest sector of the economy and in the state is second only to tourism. Many folks in rural parts of my state are exposed to the unique risks associated with volatile agricultural markets. Because of this farmers and ranchers need financial tools that allow them to mitigate these risks. This bill will bring that certainty.

Additionally, municipal utility services and co-operative energy suppliers meet nearly all

of my district's electricity needs. These groups rely heavily on risk mitigation provided by this bill. If the federal government overly regulates the use of risk mitigation, industries and constituents within my district will see hikes in their monthly energy bills.

H.R. 2289 will allow American business to run as intended without new burdensome regulations and red-tape from bureaucratic government agencies. Most importantly this bill allows the American economy to do what it does best producing the world's food and fiber while supplying affordable energy.

I congratulate Chairman CONAWAY on a well crafted bill and a thorough committee process and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the underlying bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN KLINE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 10, 2015

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes:

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment aiming to expedite cleanup within a neglected category of defense sites in my state and nationwide.

During World War II, while our troops were fighting abroad, facilities across the nation here at home were busy creating the supplies and provisions that fueled our efforts. One such site is Gopher Ordnance Works in my district. The Gopher Ordnance Works site was built and operated by the federal government during World War II for the production of smokeless gunpowder and nitric and sulfuric acids. The then-existing War Department acquired approximately 12,000 acres of farmland near Rosemount, Minnesota for the construction of the plant. After the war was won and the efforts at home wound down, the Department of the Army declared the Gopher Ordnance Works to be surplus property, and the facilities on the land were partially deconstructed. Unfortunately, some of the structures and many of the contaminants remain to this very day, more than 60 years later.

Over the years the federal government realized sites like Gopher Ordnance Works must be cleaned up. Accordingly, Congress created the Formerly Used Defense Sites—or FUDS—program as part of the Defense Environmental Restoration Program in the mid-1980s. The goal of the FUDS program is to clean up these sites so they can be put back into productive use and no longer pose a potential health threat to our constituents.

Mr. Chair, the site in my district is not unique. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers maintains an inventory of FUDS properties nationwide, and per the Army Corps, there are almost 10,000 potential properties that could qualify, with up to 2,700 of those requiring some sort of cleanup. Every single state in our nation, the District of Columbia, and our territories all have sites within their respective borders. This issue affects all of our constituents.

It is unacceptable to take so long to make so little progress in addressing these sites. It is worse if the cleanup delay is due to legal disputes over FUDS properties or simple lack of knowledge about what contaminants are present. This is the case in one subset of the FUDS program categorized as Potentially Responsible Party—or PRP—sites. PRP sites are locations where the Department of Defense as well as other parties potentially contributed to the contamination. Instead of acting on these sites and putting them back into productive use, PRP sites get mired in extensive site studies and disputes over who left what at the site.

Mr. Chair, Gopher Ordnance Works in my district is a PRP site that has not received appropriate attention from the federal agencies delegated with the authority to resolve liability and move forward with cleanup. For more than a decade, I have advocated tirelessly to the Army Corps in an attempt to facilitate cleanup and navigate its backlogged bureaucracy. Enough is enough. I am asking the Army Corps to prioritize PRP sites and move forward expeditiously toward a solution for environmental investigation and pollution cleanup costs at Gopher Ordnance Works. I am here, ready, and available to offer what assistance is necessary in Congress on behalf of my constituents. I expect the Army Corps and the Department of Defense to fulfill their mission, committing to their responsibilities toward real, productive solutions.

The underlying bill funds environmental restoration for all FUDS properties. My amendment would have required no less than \$10,000,000 of the Environmental Restoration—Formerly Used Defense Sites funds to be available for remedial investigations on the too often neglected PRP sites, removing one obstacle that is preventing these sites from becoming usable.

While it is regrettable the House Parliamentarians ruled that procedures and protocols of the House prevent this particular bill from being a vehicle to fix this problem, I will continue my efforts so these sites can finally be cleaned and restored, resolving this issue once and for all in support of our communities.

CONGRATULATING THE AL WEST
COLLISION CENTER OF ROLLA

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Al West Collision Center of Rolla on their grand opening and ribbon cutting that took place on June 1st. Not only did they host a successful event kicking off the start of their business, but were able to raise money for local charities in the process.

Over 100 people gathered at the Al West Collision Center to celebrate their grand opening. The cornerstone of the event was a raffle to win a Dodge Challenger, with one hundred percent of the profit going to two local charities. The first charity the raffle benefited is the Association of United States Army Wounded Warriors which supports wounded and severely disabled Army veterans and their families in the Rolla area. The second charity, the Greater Rolla Area Charitable Enterprise, as-

sists needy families in a variety of ways from providing them with food to even helping pay the bills. I'm proud of Missouri small businesses who give back to their community such as the Al West Collision Center.

For the money that was raised for local charities through their raffle, and to celebrate their recent grand opening, it is my pleasure to recognize the Al West Collision Center of Rolla before the House of Representatives and wish them the best of luck in their future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 2015, I was unavoidably detained during a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on the following Roll Call votes: #309, on final passage of the Commodity End-User Relief Act and #329, on final passage of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016.

HONORING MS. ANNETTE GUMM

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ms. Annette Gumm, who, after years of service to Palm Beach County, is leaving the area. I speak for the citizens of Palm Beach County when I say that she will be greatly missed.

Ms. Gumm's public service in Florida began when she moved to Gleneagles in 1986 following an early retirement. She quickly became involved in her new community by volunteering with Plumosa Elementary School and Delray Community Hospital. In 1992, she was asked to join the campaign of Burt Aaronson; and, following his victory, she served as the Commissioner's administrative aide for several years.

Ms. Gumm also joined the Atlantic Democratic Club and was pivotal in transforming the organization into the United South County Democratic Club (USCDC). She has held several positions in USCDC, including Treasurer, Vice President, and President.

The amount of time and effort Ms. Gumm has expended for the betterment of her community is truly admirable and exhibits a level of passion worthy of recognition. It is with great pleasure that I honor, my dear friend, Annette Gumm.

IN HONOR OF REV. DR. BRITT
ARMANDO STARGHILL

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Rev. Dr. Britt

Armando Starghill, a man who inspired South Jersey through his words and his selfless actions. Motivating youths to pursue academic careers and serving his church for 19 years, Armando was undoubtedly a champion for Camden, NJ and he will truly be missed by all.

Over the course of his career at Kaighn Avenue Baptist Church, Rev. Starghill's visionary leadership transformed practical ministry and his community. By connecting the church with area youths he was able to serve as a vital mentor to the community through services like hosting the Baccalaureate mass. He dedicated his entire life to serving others. Encouraging young adults in the city of Camden to attend college, Armando viewed education as the ultimate liberator for Camden's youth.

Rev. Starghill began preaching at the age of 13 and dedicated his entire life to service. After graduating from Virginia Union University, he went on to earn his doctorate from Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School, Rochester, NY. He then pursued a religious career and answered the call to serve wherever that led him. A social justice advocate, Rev. Starghill began a non-profit community development corporation to improve the socioeconomic environment for Camden's citizens. By working on the Nehemiah Project, the Reverend attempted to combine a spiritual belonging in the Baptist Church with a sense of responsibility and pride in Camden's revitalization efforts.

Rev. Starghill was also a devoted husband and father. He was also revered by his parents, who are still living in Detroit, and he will be sorely missed by his sisters, brothers, and a host of other relatives.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Starghill was an incredible man, devoted to his family and dedicated to his community. He leaves behind a great legacy and I join the Camden community and the entire state of New Jersey in honoring the achievements and the life of this extraordinary man.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,768,664,619.57. We've added \$7,525,891,615,706.49 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.

SPRINGSPIRIT BASEBALL

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I spent a recent hot, sunny day in my district visiting a real life "Field of Dreams." SpringSpirit Baseball near Houston, Texas in Spring Branch is

providing opportunities for youth to realize their dreams through sports and mentoring.

SpringSpirit's mission is to provide safe pathways for youth to realize life opportunities through sports, education, and mentoring programs based on Christian principles. They create positive mentoring relationships between the education system and families through baseball, softball, soccer, and community programs.

It is a place that values integrity, patience, perseverance and respect for the individual.

SpringSpirit provides programs combined with the teaching of the gospel designed to grow the mind, body and soul, and they have a first-class sports training and education complex in the heart of the North Spring Branch community. They pair compassionate and caring mentors with local youth, and find life opportunities that can help participants contribute to their community and society and act as stewards for others.

Recently, I toured the facility with Executive Director John Meredith, Coach Ben Vigil and a man I like to call the "Mayor" of Spring Branch, Mr. Victor Alvarez.

I cannot express how impressed I was not only with the facility, but the passion each of these men brings to SpringSpirit Baseball. SpringSpirit grew from humble beginnings at the local Boys and Girls Club to a more than three acre state-of-the-art facility.

SpringSpirit was founded by Kenny Baldwin who after playing college baseball at Rice University and professional baseball spent many successful years in the oil and gas industry. He credits his success to strong coaches, loving mentors and faith leaders and wanted to create these same opportunities and relationships for underserved youth.

Fostering partnerships with the Cal Ripken, Sr. Foundation, Camp Ozark, Chapelwood United Methodist Church, Cornerstone Family Ministries, Baseball USA and Boys and Girls Club of Greater Houston among others, SpringSpirit can offer afterschool programs, summer camps, and baseball and soccer tournaments.

Among SpringSpirit's biggest fans are baseball greats Lance Berkman and Andy Pettitte. Berkman and Pettitte support SpringSpirit by serving as chairs of their annual fundraiser and if you drop by SpringSpirit at just the right time . . . you might be able to catch Lance mentoring some of the kids!

Kenny, John, and the entire staff at SpringSpirit Baseball should be commended for their selfless service to the community.

Their vision to build a superb facility, offer it to the youth of Spring Branch, and lead by example truly enriches our community and our city.

And that's just the way it is.

IN SUPPORT OF REAUTHORIZING
THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for the House to bring H.R. 1031, the Promoting U.S. Jobs Through Exports Act for an immediate vote. This critical legislation would reauthorize the Export-Import

Bank of the United States, our nation's official export credit agency for the next seven years.

Currently, the Ex-Im Bank's charter will expire at the end of this month if immediate action is not taken. If Congress fails to do its job, hundreds of thousands of American jobs, including over 10,000 jobs in my district in Houston and Harris County, Texas may be lost to China, Japan, and other foreign competitors if we force Ex-Im to close its doors.

The Export-Import Bank, created 80 years ago during the depths of the Great Depression, has been authorized 16 times by Congress with overwhelming bipartisan majorities and has broad support from industry and labor for the very simple fact that it works.

In the past six years, Ex-Im has supported more than 1.3 million jobs and has returned over \$2 billion in deficit-reducing profits to the U.S. Treasury while providing over \$27 billion in export credit last year alone.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when foreign competition is becoming more fierce than ever before, with nations like China using any means necessary to win contracts in overseas markets, Congress must do everything in its power to support American small businesses and working families, including the immediate, long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

HONORING MR. LARRY FLYNN

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Larry Flynn for his contributions to the aerospace industry, General Dynamics and Gulfstream Aerospace, the largest private employer in the First District of Georgia.

Mr. Flynn's career spans 33 years, beginning in 1982 when he joined what was then known as Combs Gates and served as executive vice president and general manager. He later served as regional vice president for Signature Flight Support. His experience in managing aircraft service facilities led to his position as vice president, Location Based Services, for Stevens Aviation, where he was responsible for managing six service facilities and overseeing service on various models of corporate jets.

Mr. Flynn joined Gulfstream in 1995 as vice president and served in several key positions to include president of Product Support and senior vice president of Sales and Marketing. He became Gulfstream's president in 2011, and also served as a vice president of General Dynamics. During Mr. Flynn's tenure as president, Gulfstream achieved several significant milestones, including a seven-year, \$500 million Savannah facility expansion; the entry into service of the G280, the market-changing G650 and its extended-range variant, the G650ER; the unveiling of the G500; the announcement of the G600; the opening of the Beijing service center and the expansions of Gulfstream service centers in Brazil; London; Westfield, Massachusetts; and Brunswick, Georgia.

Mr. Flynn served on the Board of Directors of the General Aviation Manufacturers Association as chairman of the Communications

Committee. He also served on the Board of Governors of The Wings Club. After earning a bachelor's degree in business administration from the University of Kansas, he completed a master's degree in manpower management from the same university.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join Mr. Flynn's colleagues, family and friends in celebrating his many years of hard work and dedication to the aerospace industry and the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed roll call votes 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329. If present, I would have voted "no" on roll call 319, "no" on roll call 320, "no" on roll call 321, "no" on roll call 322, "no" on roll call 323, "yea" on roll call 324, "no" on roll call 325, "yea" on roll call 326, "no" on roll call 327, "yea" on roll call 328, and "no" on roll call 329.

CELEBRATING D.C. FLAG DAY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating D.C. Flag Day, Sunday, June 14, 2015, which will be celebrated beginning this Saturday. All are invited to the fourth annual D.C. Flag Day Festival in Dupont Circle, celebrating the determination of the people of the District of Columbia to continue to fight for equal rights and statehood under the American flag. D.C. residents have struggled for equal rights since the city became the nation's capital in 1801. Although the city did not achieve home rule until 1973, D.C. finally got its own flag in 1938, when Congress commissioned a competition, and native Washingtonian Charles Dunn designed the current flag from the coat of arms of George Washington.

Thanks to the D.C. Flag Festival organizers, the event showcases everything that makes D.C. unique—our diverse communities, music, arts, food, and our D.C. flag—all of which will be on display for enjoyment and entertainment. However, on D.C. Flag Day, residents will rally not only for the American flag but also their flag, to show pride in their city and demand statehood. Residents began to celebrate D.C. Flag Day in 2011, and June 14 continues to serve as an important day to mark the quest for freedom and equal rights for the citizens of hometown Washington, D.C. D.C. Flag Day coincides with national Flag Day, which has been a national holiday since 1886, and inspired the organizers of D.C. Flag Day to celebrate the event locally in the District of Columbia.

At this weekend's D.C. Flag Day, we celebrate the District's own flag as well as the American flag. As residents show pride for our country and their hometown, they also con-

tinue to fight for the equal treatment the flag symbolizes. The American flag, our national symbol of patriotism and love of country, emboldens our continuous battle for self-government, voting rights, and statehood for the more than 650,000 taxpaying American citizens who live here.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing D.C. Flag Day, its two-day celebration on June 13 and 14, and the organizers of the D.C. Flag Day celebration for their exemplary efforts to ensure equal rights for the citizens of the District of Columbia by creating pride in the city and promoting the city's rich cultural heritage.

COMMEMORATING THE 71ST ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY AND REMEMBERING THE MEMBERS OF THE GREATEST GENERATION WHO SAVED FREEDOM IN THE WORLD

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in humble gratitude to commemorate the 71st anniversary of D-Day, the Allied Forces' audacious amphibious landing at Normandy, France, on June 6, 1944.

"Operation Overlord," as D-Day was formally known, was the largest single amphibious assault in the history of warfare.

The success of D-Day, which was far from certain at the outset, led to the liberation of Western Europe, signaled the death knell of the German Wehrmacht, and paved the way to unconditional victory by the Allied Forces over the evils of Nazism, fascism, and Japanese imperialism.

It is no exaggeration to say that D-Day changed the course of human history.

The aim of the meticulously planned D-Day operation was to open a second front in the European war theater from which the Allied Forces could attack the German army and push east to capture Berlin.

With the Russian Army advancing from the east, coupled with the southern front opened by the Allied invasion of Italy from North Africa in 1942, the opening of a western front would set in motion the pincer movement that would catch the German Army in a trap from which there would be no escape.

The formidable German Army expected that the Allied Forces would try to launch an invasion from the western beaches of France, they just did not know when or where.

So in anticipation of an Allied invasion, the Nazis constructed the infamous Atlantic Wall, an extensive system of coastal fortifications built along the western coast of Europe and Scandinavia.

Under the direction of Field Marshal Rommel, the Atlantic Wall was reinforced by the addition of concrete pillboxes built along the beaches to house machine guns, antitank guns and light artillery.

Mines and antitank obstacles were planted on the beaches themselves and underwater obstacles and mines were placed in waters just off shore.

By the time of the D-Day landing, the Nazis had laid almost six million mines in northern France.

And awaiting Allied soldiers who made their way onto and away from the beaches were gun emplacements and minefields extended inland.

"War is hell," said General William Tecumseh Sherman during the Civil War.

And that is an apt description of what awaited the brave Allied warriors who set sail from England to the beaches of Normandy in the early morning of June 6, 1944, at the beginning of what has rightly been called "The Longest Day."

But they were buoyed in their resolve by the millions of prayers from Americans and others back home, of all races, religions, and creeds, invoking the Lord's blessing, mercy, and grace.

With the outcome in doubt, President Franklin Roosevelt asked the nation to join him in this solemn prayer:

Almighty God: Our sons, pride of our nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity.

Lead them straight and true; give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness in their faith.

They will need Thy blessings.

For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace.

They fight not for the lust of conquest.

They fight to end conquest.

They fight to liberate.

They fight to let justice arise, and tolerance and goodwill among all Thy people.

They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home.

The prayers were needed because the cost of D-Day was high; U.S. casualties on D-Day totaled more than 2,499 dead, 3,184 wounded, 1,928 missing, and 26 captured.

Our British and Canadian allies suffered terrible losses on D-Day as well: approximately 2,700 for the British and 946 for the Canadians. German casualties are estimated at 4,000 to 9,000.

In total, the number of combatants killed, wounded or missing in the Battle of Normandy for both sides exceeded 425,000, not including the estimated 15,000 to 20,000 French civilians killed.

But the operation was a success.

More than 156,000 troops or paratroopers came ashore on D-Day, 73,000 from the U.S., 83,000 from Great Britain and Canada.

By the end of June 11, D-Day+5, 326,547 troops, 54,186 vehicles and 104,428 tons of supplies had come ashore.

And with them the seeds for the victory in Europe that would come less than a year later, on May 8, 1945, with the fall of Berlin and the unconditional surrender of the Nazis.

On the eve of the Normandy invasion, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces, addressed the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the Allied Expeditionary Forces and said to them that they were about to embark upon a "Great Crusade," and that the "eyes of the world" were upon you.

He told them that their task would not be easy because the "enemy is well trained, well equipped and battle-hardened. He will fight savagely."

But, General Eisenhower said, "this is the year 1944. The tide has turned. The free men of the world are marching together to victory."

And march to victory they did, fully justifying General Eisenhower's "confidence in their courage, devotion to duty, and skill in battle."

Because of the heroism of these men who willingly risked their lives to be the tip of the spear of liberty, the war was won and a world was saved for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, D-Day was, and remains, a day like no other in the history of man's sojourn on earth.

We remember Gettysburg.

There, President Lincoln paid tribute to those "who gave their lives so that the nation might live."

And it is equally fitting and proper that we remember D-Day.

And that we continue to honor those who risked all and gave all so that the world could remain free.

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. ROSE
OF LIMA CATHOLIC CHURCH

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 125th anniversary of St. Rose of Lima Catholic Church located in DeSoto, Missouri. St. Rose has been home to many life changing events for its parishioners and became a city landmark.

St. Rose Church was dedicated on June 21, 1885 in honor of St. Rose of Lima. Starting with just a few worshippers, it today has grown to over 550 registered and active families from the area who attend its services. Having hosted countless baptisms, weddings, and confirmations, St. Rose has long been a place for parishioners to celebrate life and their commitment to God. The church's stone walls, soaring tower, and beautiful stained-glass windows will continue to keep watch over the city of DeSoto and its people for years to come.

For the special place it holds in the hearts and lives of many in the community, as well as its place as a landmark in the city of DeSoto, it is my pleasure to recognize the 125th anniversary of St. Rose Church before the House of Representatives.

HONORING SUE DEWINE

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary accomplishments and career of Sue DeWine, President of Hanover College, located in Indiana's 6th District.

After more than 40 years in education, Sue became the first female President of Hanover College in 2007. During her tenure, overall enrollment at the college increased by 20% and campus diversity grew from 9% to 15%, where it currently stands. In addition to many other achievements, President DeWine made it possible for faculty and student representatives to serve on the Board of Trustees at the college. It's a move that helped solidify her reputation as leader who listened to and advocated for her students and faculty.

President DeWine will be retiring in the coming weeks, and she will be missed by all

those whom worked with her. Her leadership touched the lives of thousands and her commitment to Hanover's students and faculty will never be forgotten. I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in thanking her for her long career and distinguished service.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF
JOÃO BOSCO MOTA AMARAL

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues Mr. NUNES and Mr. VALADAO to recognize the career of a distinguished Portuguese politician, and an old friend, João Bosco Mota Amaral. Mota Amaral, former President of the Autonomous Regional Government of the Azores, has devoted his life to serving the Azores and the Portuguese people. He deserves to be commended for his tireless work and service towards the advancement of Azorean and Portuguese interests.

Mota Amaral was born on April 15, 1943 in Ponta Delgada on the island of São Miguel in the Azores. He was a very diligent and studious individual, and graduated from the University of Lisbon in 1965 with a law degree. He also completed, with distinction, the Complimentary Course of Political and Economic Sciences at the University of Lisbon in 1966, defending his thesis on the topic "Civil Liability of Public Administration."

Mota Amaral practiced law in Lisbon in the late 1960's, where he specialized in administrative and tax issues. He was then elected as Deputy to the National Assembly in 1969 and he championed issues important to the Azores. Following the Carnation Revolution of April 25, 1974, in which the authoritarian Estado Novo regime was overthrown, Mota Amaral emerged as a new political leader. He helped establish the Popular Democratic Party (PPD) later named the Social Democratic Party (PSD) in the Azores.

Shortly after the creation of the PPD, the question of autonomy for the Azores was outlined in the Party's principles. On November 8, 1974 Mota Amaral presented the Politico-Administrative Statute of the Autonomous Region of the Azores, lobbying for the archipelago to become an autonomous region within the context of the Portuguese Republic and governed by a Regional Assembly with elected members. This dream would come to fruition on April 2, 1976 when the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic was approved and the Azores achieved political autonomy.

Mota Amaral was elected to Parliament in 1976, but suspended the mandate in order to serve as the first President of the Government of the Azores. He subsequently won four more regional elections and served until 1995. Between 1995 and 2002, Mota Amaral served as the Vice-President of the National Assembly. In 2002, he was elected President of the National Assembly, a position he held until 2005.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that Mr. NUNES, Mr. VALADAO and I ask our colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize and honor the accomplishments of a great servant to the Azores and Portugal. João Bosco Mota Amaral has truly left a mark

on the Azorean and Portuguese communities here in the U.S. and around the world, and we owe him our thanks and praise for advancing Azorean and Portuguese interests.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on several roll call votes and I would like to state my intentions on the following:

1. Roll Call No. 298—McClintock (R-CA), yes
2. Roll Call No. 299—Walberg (R-MI), yes
3. Roll Call No. 308—Esty (D-CT), no
4. Roll Call No. 301—Cartwright (D-PA), no
5. Roll Call No. 302—Garrett (R-NJ), yes
6. Roll Call No. 303—Brooks #1 (R-AL), yes
7. Roll Call No. 304—Brooks #2 (R-AL), yes
8. Roll Call No. 305—Capps (D-CA), no
9. Roll Call No. 307—Stivers (R-OH), yes

CONGRATULATING SHIRLEY
MAGAÑA ON A DISTINGUISHED
CAREER AND WELL-DESERVED
RETIREMENT

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Shirley Magaña on her retirement from Guthrie Corning Hospital.

Ms. Magaña has served as President and Chief Operating Officer of Corning Hospital since 2008. She has more than 35 years of experience in patient care and hospital operations.

Corning Hospital has blossomed under Ms. Magaña's leadership. During her tenure the hospital has expanded its operations and capabilities, allowing it to effectively serve the needs of our region. Ms. Magaña was instrumental in the building of a new 232,000 square foot facility; her fundraising efforts resulted in over \$5 million for the construction of the new hospital. This new state-of-the-art facility features a cancer treatment center and allows the hospital to provide lifesaving services and resources.

Ms. Magaña has worked tirelessly to better our local community. She is a member of the Corning Rotary Club and Corning Area Chamber of Commerce. She also serves as Co-Chair of the Fit & Strong Together Committee at Corning Hospital.

Throughout her distinguished career, Shirley Magaña has consistently provided exceptional medical care to those in need. She has positively impacted our local healthcare profession, and our neighbors are safer and healthier because of her years of dedicated service. I commend Ms. Magaña on a successful career and I wish her the very best in her well-deserved retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that yesterday, June 10, 2015, I incorrectly cast my vote in favor of the Country of Origin Labeling Act (H.R. 2393), Roll Call No. 333. I intended to vote "NO" on this legislation.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MISSOURI VETERANS HOME OF CAPE GIRARDEAU

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 25th Anniversary of the Missouri Veterans Home of Cape Girardeau. For the past 25 years, the administration and staff of the home have made the care of our nation's heroes their number one priority.

The Missouri Veterans Home of Cape Girardeau serves as a prominent asset to the well being of our veterans by providing them with medical care, counseling services, and documentation assistance they need and deserve. I am very proud of their service to the community of Cape Girardeau and the surrounding area.

For their tireless effort and devotion to serving our veterans in Missouri, it is my pleasure to recognize the 25th Anniversary of the Missouri Veterans Home of Cape Girardeau.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call number 326 I am recorded as a Nay. I would like to reflect my intention was to vote Yea.

RECOGNIZING THE QUAD COUNTY URBAN LEAGUE AND THE STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN TOMORROW'S SCIENTISTS, TECHNICIANS, AND MANAGERS AND PROJECT READY

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Quad County Urban League and the students participating in two of its important programs: Tomorrow's Scientists, Technicians, and Managers, and Project Ready.

For over twenty years, the Quad County Urban League has sponsored Tomorrow's Scientists, Technicians, and Managers in an ef-

fort to inspire young minority students to pursue their goals. Over 1,800 students have benefited from the tutoring, workshops, college visits, and guest speakers provided by the program. Students who have completed the program maintain excellent grade point averages, receive thousands of dollars in scholarships, and contribute countless hours giving back to their community.

More recently, the Quad County Urban League has introduced Project Ready, a program with the goal of familiarizing minority students and their families with the college decision making process. By introducing concepts like college admissions and financial aid early on, Project Ready prepares a path for strong academic students to pursue post-secondary STEM Education.

Congratulations to the Quad County Urban League and the students who have participated in these rigorous programs. Real differences are being made in our communities because of programs like Tomorrow's Scientists, Technicians, and Managers, and Project Ready.

RECOGNIZING THE PUERTO RICAN FAMILY INSTITUTE

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an organization that has evolved into an important anchor in both New York City and in Puerto Rico. The Puerto Rican Family Institute (PRFI) provides a wide range of critical social and health services, strengthening our neighborhoods.

For some of our youngest neighbors, PRFI operates 35 Head Start centers located in Brooklyn, the Bronx and San Juan, Puerto Rico. 1,396 children benefit from this initiative, which provides pre-school children of low-income families a comprehensive child development program to meet their educational, emotional, social, health and nutritional needs. In addition, the Institute operates four full-day Universal Pre-K classrooms serving over 60 children in Brooklyn and the Bronx.

On the other end of the age spectrum, PRFI is equally committed to caring for the seniors in our community. The Life Line Center for Latino Seniors is based at the Brooklyn Mental Health Clinic, and offers seniors counseling, assistance with obtaining financial entitlements, referrals for medical services, food stamp assistance, as well as group and peer support.

Mental health services are also part of PRFI's portfolio. The Children's Intensive Case Management Program targets assistance to emotionally disturbed children in need of clinical case management and supervision. In addition PRFI runs a center helping emotionally disturbed adolescents, and provides adult supportive services to homeless mentally ill individuals. 1,128 clients benefit from this service, making it the largest in our state.

Housing assistance is made available to developmentally disabled individuals through PRFI's quality community based residential services, which aims to provide skills that will enable program beneficiaries to live as independently as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on. From health services, to nutritional programs, PRFI helps meet the needs of ten thousand families and children residing in New York and Puerto Rico. The assistance offered extends well beyond the Latino community reaching individuals of all backgrounds. What all of PRFI's programs have in common is that they provide a helping hand to some of our most vulnerable neighbors. Whether it is the senior citizen struggling to get by on a fixed income, a low-income family endeavoring to raise children or a developmentally disabled person wanting to lead a richer life, PRFI harnesses the strengths of our community to assist them.

BULK DATA COLLECTION TRAMPLES OUR RIGHTS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the unrestricted and unconstitutional bulk data collection program started by the NSA represents the worst of the Washington Machine.

A recent poll shows that a majority of Americans agree.

The government should not have the authority to collect information without first obtaining a warrant. Period.

Our Founders feared a government powerful enough to commit unreasonable searches and seizures, so they crafted the Fourth Amendment to protect our right to privacy.

Though technology has evolved and continues to do so, the Constitution remains the same.

Gone are the days where Americans use their cellphones exclusively for phone calls and text messages.

Many people also use their phones for daily activities from tracking their steps to logging their finances or inputting what they ate that day.

The Fourth Amendment protects our phone conversations, our emails, our texts, our Internet history, our bank statements and more.

The NSA bulk-collection program tramples our rights.

Recently, the 2nd U.S. Court of Appeals deemed this bulk collection of data illegal.

Now, some members of Congress are trying to pass a law that allows this illegal surveillance to continue, and I will not stand for it.

The House of Representatives recently passed the USA Freedom Act, which makes some steps to limit data collection under Section 215 of the Patriot Act; however, the bill does nothing to limit government spying under Section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act.

Contrary to claims that the House bill would "end bulk surveillance," the truth is it would not.

The NSA uses Section 702 as a means to gather not only data, but actual content of communications—content of your phone calls, texts and emails. Section 702 is more intrusive than Section 215.

In the course of this collection, the content of American citizens, many of whom have done nothing wrong or illegal, is also collected.

Current law allows law enforcement to then search through this data for information and they can do so without a warrant.

Reverse-targeting of American citizens is inconsistent with the Constitution and must stop now.

Opponents of civil liberties will argue that these mass invasions of privacy will make us safer.

Americans should not have to give up their constitutional rights for national security.

Casting too wide of a collection net for intelligence can be a distraction from the analysis necessary to stop plots and—to counter terrorism.

Let's be clear: The NSA should keep close watch on suspected terrorists to keep our country safe.

But before invading the privacy of American citizens, a warrant must and can be obtained in a timely manner.

Programs that permit due process and are held accountable by an open court will serve as a just way to collect intelligence.

The sacrifice of our personal liberty for security is and will forever be a false choice.

I have introduced several pieces of legislation that would restrain the federal government: This legislation includes H.R. 2233, the End Warrantless Surveillance of Americans Act. H.R. 2233 would prohibit warrantless searches of government databases for information that pertains to U.S. citizens. It would also forbid government agencies from mandating or requesting “back doors” into commercial products that can be used for surveillance.

This legislation mirrors an amendment that was offered to the USA Freedom Act, which was backed by a broad bipartisan coalition, including members of Congress and outside groups across the political spectrum.

The fight for NSA reform is ongoing, and I will continue to stand up and defend the Bill of Rights.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING TIM SBRANTI ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to recognize a great teacher, mentor, and friend, Tim Sbranti, as he retires after 17 years of public school teaching.

Since 1978, Tim has been a resident of our shared hometown, Dublin, California. Tim's service to Dublin started early, serving as student body president at Dublin High School and on the Parks and Community Service Commission.

After graduating from California State University, Sacramento, Tim returned to his hometown to teach and coach at his high school alma mater. I was fortunate enough to have Tim as my economics teacher, mock trial advisor, and tennis coach. As an educator, Tim encouraged me and countless other young people to help our community and go into public service. Over the past 17 years, few people have shaped the lives and inspired more youth in Dublin than Tim Sbranti.

Tim's advocacy for public education reached beyond Dublin. He worked as the chair of the California Teachers Association's Political In-

volvement Committee and led Californians Dedicated to Education. Beyond education, Tim has committed himself to working in all areas to better our local community. I was honored to serve with Tim when he and I were members of the Dublin City Council. Tim served on the City Council from 2002 to 2006, and as Dublin's mayor, from 2008 and 2014.

While always putting his hometown first, Tim has also been active in advancing opportunity in the greater Tri-Valley area. Tim has served as a board member of the Tri-Valley Housing and Opportunity Center, Dublin Historical Preservation Association, and Las Positas College Foundation. And, he is a past president of the Dublin Lions Club.

I am honored today to have the opportunity to publicly recognize Tim's many years of teaching and contributions to our shared hometown and the Tri-Valley.

HONORING BURNEY STARKS

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize a leader in Tucson's community who dedicated his life to serve others.

Mr. Starks was a 1969 graduate of Pueblo High School, a proud Pueblo Warrior. In 1974 he graduated with honors from the University of Arizona where he also played football for the Wildcats. He then earned a Master's degree from Troy University. He was also known for his skills as an actor and singer. He appeared onstage in productions such as “Driving Miss Daisy” and “Look Ma, We're Dancing,” as well as many others. Mr. Starks also sang with the True Devotion Motown Revue.

Mr. Starks was a U.S. Army veteran. He went on active duty as an Army officer and had tours of duty in Georgia, Indiana, Missouri and South Korea. Following his initial active duty tour he returned to Tucson where he hosted a TV talk show called “Looking Black” and worked for Tucson Unified School District. He returned to active duty in 1981 and retired from the military service in 1996 at the rank of Major. After leaving active duty he worked for the Tucson Urban League and returned to Tucson Unified School District. Mr. Burney Starks was known as the long time educator at Pueblo High School, a school counselor specializing in dropout prevention. He instilled in the minds of those who didn't believe in themselves that they could accomplish anything they set their minds to, that nothing was out of reach as long as they wanted it enough and were willing to work towards it. Mr. Starks was also known for the many community activities he was a part of and in some cases was the driving force for. Burney served on the boards of the Tucson Arizona Boys Chorus, the Dunbar Coalition, the America Israel Friendship League, the Southern Arizona Academic Decathlon, the Pueblo Warrior Alumni Foundation and as President of the Board of the Tucson Juneteenth Festival Committee. He also served as Lieutenant Governor for Kiwanis International where he had been a member for 35 years; He was past commander in the Military Order of the World Wars and past president in the Reserve Officers Association.

He is survived by his wife Ruth M. Starks, 5 children Benjamin S., Burnes O. III, Elizabeth M., Bryan M., and Rebekah R.

Burney has 9 Siblings/Gary E., Daryl D., Terry L., Charles G., Donna R., Harry J., Jacqueline B., Larry D., and Timothy B.

Burney Starks has left a legacy which he will be remembered for and honored for years to come.

IN HONOR OF ELIJAH “SONNY” SINGLETON, JR.

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincere condolences and to honor the memory of Elijah “Sonny” Singleton, Jr., for his achievements, contributions, and service to his community as a loving father and pillar of civic engagement.

Elijah Singleton spent his life serving his community as a teamster, putting the needs of others before his own. Elijah was also active as a member of his local union, imparting the importance of citizenship to his children at an early age. He taught them the value of a day's work and to appreciate life's gifts and opportunities.

His monumental example was the inspiration for his son, Troy, who now serves in the New Jersey General Assembly. Pursuing a life of service and following the lessons of his father, Troy once remarked that his father never looked for short cuts because true success only comes as a result of hard work and diligence.

Mr. Speaker, Elijah Singleton's dedication to family, community, and public service was evident. As a family man, he constantly surrounded himself with those he cared for, and no one worked harder or loved more passionately than Elijah. He is survived by two devoted sons, Troy and Derrick, and six adoring grandchildren. I join the South Jersey community and the State of New Jersey in honoring the life and accomplishments of this great man.

HONORING FRANK NASH

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Frank Nash from Ironton, Missouri for his academic success and service to our community.

Frank has set a wonderful example of hard work and a dedication to serve others. Now an Eagle Scout, Frank has earned nine Eagle Palms since he started as a Tiger Cub with the Boy Scouts. For his Eagle Scout project, Frank built tables and chairs for senior adults at his church to use. He also built a flower box to decorate the First Baptist Church of Pilot Knob's sign.

He is the salutatorian of his graduating class and has already earned more than 40 college credits through his high school's advanced placement program. He will be attending the

University of Missouri-Kansas City in the fall where he is interested in studying neurology.

On April 1, Frank was notified that he was the sole recipient of the National Eagle Scout Association's \$25,000 United Health Foundation college scholarship. This scholarship, which receives more than 5,000 applications each year, is awarded to a student who plans to pursue a career in healthcare and is willing to reinvest their skills in an under-served community. Frank has also received scholarships from the Hagan Foundation and the Elks National Foundation. It comes as no surprise that his hard work, both in the community and the classroom, have paid off.

Frank is a role model for all Missouri students and it is my pleasure to recognize his efforts and accomplishments before the House of Representatives.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE
OF MASTER SERGEANT
TAUTALAGIA "TUNI" SOTOA
NUMERA

**HON. AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN
RADEWAGEN**

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Master Sergeant Tantalagia Sotoa Numera, or known to his family and friends simply as "Tuni", who passed away on June 1 at the age of 86.

Tuni was born on February 27, 1929, in Pago Pago, American Samoa to parents, Tauga and Siao Numera. Following his childhood on the islands, and at the young age of 23, Tuni enthusiastically fulfilled his childhood dream of serving in our nations armed forces and joined the U.S. Marine Corps.

During Tuni's 27 years of service in the Marine Corps, he would fight in two wars and serve 8 total combat tours. Tuni saw his first action in Korea, but it wouldn't be his last . . . not by a long shot.

Master Sergeant Numera served 7 combat tours in the jungles of Vietnam. During his first tour in Vietnam, Tuni was wounded in combat for which he received the Purple Heart. While this would be more than enough sacrifice to one's nation for even the toughest and most patriotic of soldiers, it wasn't for Tuni. He would return to those jungles where he was initially wounded, 6 more times. When once asked by a friend "why did you serve 7 tours in Vietnam?" he replied . . . "I was looking for the guy that shot me during my first tour." This is a perfect example of just how much of a true Leatherneck he was.

Master Sergeant Numera was awarded numerous decorations during his career in the Marines, including: the Navy & Marine Corps Medal, the Bronze Star, and of course the Purple Heart, with a Gold Star, which is the equivalent of two Purple Hearts.

Known for his irresistible smile and grand sense of humor, Tuni was always at the center of whatever was going on and always had a kind word or helping hand to those who needed it.

Tuni also enjoyed a number of recreational activities, including fishing, bowling, playing poker, watching westerns, and TV shows like Walker Texas Ranger.

Perhaps the only things that Tuni loved more than his country were his faith in God and his beautiful family. Tuni is survived by his wife, Eleanor; children, Zina, Trinidad, Cynthia, Anthony, Jeffrey, Michael, Elena, and Christina; "adopted sons," Vincent, and Mike; 26 grandchildren, and 15 great-grandchildren. This man was obviously very loved by all who knew him and we all mourn their loss.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to join me recognizing the lifelong service and dedication to our nation that was exemplified by Master Sergeant Numera and honor him by continuing to uphold those values that we cherish as Americans and for which Tuni dedicated his life.

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Immigrant Heritage Month and salute the contributions of immigrants to the never ending glory and story of America.

I stand in solidarity with our immigrant soldiers who have fought to defend and extend our freedoms from the shores of the Atlantic to the Pacific, in the deserts of Africa and the jungles of Asia, to the seas of the Persian Gulf.

I stand in solidarity with our immigrant innovators and entrepreneurs who make up over 40 percent of the CEO of the Fortune 500 companies, which employ over 3 million of our fellow citizens.

And I stand in solidarity with the children of our immigrants who will be an integral part of our nation's future achievements.

This is why I have consistently introduced legislation such as H.R. 1525, "Save America Comprehensive Immigration Act of 2013," which sets forth a comprehensive and humane solution to immigrant reform.

This legislation works to secure our borders and brings close to 12 million illegal immigrants out of the shadows of society through earned access to legalization.

Our country has made progress because of the work and determination of immigrants and we owe it to them and ourselves to maintain a system that allows immigrants to prosper within our borders through approved legal processes.

In 1884 a Serbian immigrant name Nikola Tesla worked with American innovator Thomas Edison and would later contribute to the development of the alternating-current electrical system.

A son of an immigrant slave, Benjamin Banneker would grow up to be a scientist, surveyor, and author; these pioneers of their fields have helped advance the American economy through innovation.

We are a more prosperous nation because of the contributions from immigrants who helped build this country, but we have not done enough.

President Obama has used his executive powers to provide more resources for border security, modernizing the legal immigration system for workers, employers, and students, and focusing enforcement on the real threats to security.

Although more remains to be done to realize the full promise of the America dream for many immigrants, we continue to fight for those who are already contributing members of their communities to ensure there is a safe and legal path to the ultimate goal of full citizenship.

The unity of families is an essential American value and should be one of the fundamentals of immigration reform, along with increasing the diversity of immigration from parts of the world that have been historically underrepresented such as the Caribbean, Africa, and Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, my district is home to the most racially and ethnically diverse metropolitan area in the nation, and as a result I celebrate our immigrant leaders such as Texas Representative Hubert Vo, born in South Vietnam, graduate of the University of Houston, and now public servant for the people of District 149.

I celebrate Joseph Pulitzer a Hungarian immigrant soldier who served in the Civil War under the Union Army whose contributions would leave a legacy of literary excellence; Hakeem Olajuwon a Nigerian native and celebrated athlete of Houston who led the Houston Rockets to the NBA championship in 1994 and 1995, and the countless others who have made significant impacts that have advanced our nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to acknowledge the achievements of just a few of the countless Americans who have braved the seas and sands to build a new life in America and enrich the cultural tapestry of the greatest nation on earth.

I recognize that our nation would not enjoy the freedoms we have today without the dedication and hard work of our immigrant ancestors and we owe it to them to work on a more comprehensive immigration reform.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SHORT-TERM DISABILITY INSURANCE ACT OF 2015

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Federal Employee Short-Term Disability Insurance Act of 2015, which will help provide financial relief for federal employees who have a short-term injury or disability, become pregnant, or develop a pregnancy-related illness. This bill will offer federal employees short-term disability insurance at no cost to the federal government. Employees will be responsible for 100 percent of the premiums, and will be able to receive disability insurance benefits for up to one year that would replace a portion of their lost income due to a non-work related injury, illness, or pregnancy. These benefits will be particularly beneficial to ensure that our federal employees, who do not yet enjoy paid maternity leave, are able to utilize the 12 weeks of unpaid maternity leave permitted by federal law while continuing to pay their bills, buy groceries, and make their mortgage, car, and other loan payments without having to deplete their retirement or other savings accounts. Too many federal employees do not take advantage of federal unpaid

maternity leave because they have no way to replace the lost income.

I decided to investigate how we could provide short-term disability insurance for federal employees after learning that many of them already buy short-term disability insurance as individuals in the private market at high individual rates. Although federal employees have good health insurance, federal health benefits do not replace lost income if employees are unable to work. Moreover, while federal employees may have available sick or annual leave days, they may not have enough such days to pay the bills if they have to be out of work for an extended period. Although there are long-term disability options for federal employees who become permanently disabled, federal employees do not qualify for such benefits until they have worked for the federal government for at least 18 months. My bill does no more than put federal employees in the same position as their private-sector counterparts, who have access to disability insurance through an employer at group rates. This bill will not allow participating insurance companies to exclude persons based on pre-existing conditions. Because of the federal government's purchasing power, this bill will provide these benefits at a more competitive

rate than is available if an employee sought such insurance as an individual.

According to the Social Security Administration, a 20-year-old worker has a one in four chance of becoming disabled by retirement age. The majority of disabilities are not caused by major accidents, but by conditions or illnesses, such as cancer or back injuries, according to the Council for Disability Awareness. There is every reason to allow our federal employees to take advantage of the federal government's group rates to obtain the most reasonable price if they choose to purchase short-term disability coverage on their own at no cost to the federal government.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

YUCAIPA HIGH SCHOOL WOMEN
SOFTBALL TEAM CIF SOUTHERN
SELECT DIVISION II CHAMPIONS

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 2015

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the Yucaipa High School

Women's Softball team for ending their season as California Interscholastic Federation Southern Section Division II champions. The team has been named the 2015 Cal-Hi Sports State Team of the Year.

The Thunderbirds have had a rewarding season with an incredible 31 wins. Last Friday, the ladies scored another victory when they beat the undefeated Mission Viejo high school at the final game in Irving, California. With dedication and commitment, the team, along with their head coach David Kivett, earned the title after an entire season of hard work.

In closing, I'd like to joyously congratulate the players: Alexis Avalos, Kaitlyn Alvarado, Annie Bakenhus, Brooke Bolinger, Brooke Brady, Skyler Burke, Keely Clark, Mallorie Cross, Jordan Green, Jordan Herron, Jazzy Lopez, Kayla Martin, Megan Martin, Kelly Martinez, Madyson Marvuli, Blayne Nelson, and Kora Shoemaker.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4063–S4118

Measures Introduced: Twenty bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1551–1570, and S. Res. 199–200. **Pages S4103–04**

Measures Reported:

H.R. 23, to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–62)

S. 1558, making appropriations for Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016. (S. Rept. No. 114–63)

H.R. 2250, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–64)

S. 756, to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria. **Page S4103**

Measures Passed:

Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver: Senate passed S. 1568, to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center. **Page S4116**

Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act: Senate passed H.R. 615, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S4116–17**

Authorizing the Reprinting of the 25th Edition Pocket Constitution: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 54, authorizing the reprinting of the 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution. **Page S4117**

Measures Considered:

National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 1735, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S4073–90**

Withdrawn:

McCain (for Burr) Modified Amendment No. 1569 (to Amendment No. 1463), to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats. **Pages S4073, S4089**

Pending:

McCain Amendment No. 1463, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4073**

McCain Amendment No. 1456 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require additional information supporting long-range plans for construction of naval vessels. **Page S4073**

Cornyn Amendment No. 1486 (to Amendment No. 1463), to require reporting on energy security issues involving Europe and the Russian Federation, and to express the sense of Congress regarding ways the United States could help vulnerable allies and partners with energy security. **Page S4073**

Vitter Modified Amendment No. 1473 (to Amendment No. 1463), to limit the retirement of Army combat units. **Pages S4073, S4075, S4083**

Markey Amendment No. 1645 (to Amendment No. 1463), to express the sense of Congress that exports of crude oil to United States allies and partners should not be determined to be consistent with the national interest if those exports would increase energy prices in the United States for American consumers or businesses or increase the reliance of the United States on imported oil. **Page S4073**

Reed (for Blumenthal) Modified Amendment No. 1564 (to Amendment No. 1463), to enhance protections accorded to servicemembers and their spouses. **Pages S4073, S4075–83**

McCain (for Paul) Modified Amendment No. 1543 (to Amendment No. 1463), to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government. **Page S4073**

Reed (for Durbin) Modified Amendment No. 1559 (to Amendment No. 1463), to prohibit the award of Department of Defense contracts to inverted domestic corporations. **Page S4073**

Feinstein (for McCain) Amendment No. 1889 (to Amendment No. 1463), to reaffirm the prohibition on torture. **Page S4073**

Fischer/Booker Amendment No. 1825 (to Amendment No. 1463), to authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. **Page S4073**

Lee Amendment No. 1687 (to Amendment No. 1473), to provide for the protection and recovery of the greater sage-grouse, the conservation of lesser prairie-chickens, and the removal of endangered species status for the American burying beetle. **Pages S4083–88**

McCain (for Ernst/Boxer) Amendment No. 1549 (to Amendment No. 1463), to provide for a temporary, emergency authorization of defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government. **Pages S4089–90**

Reed (for Gillibrand) Amendment No. 1578 (to Amendment No. 1463), to reform procedures for determinations to proceed to trial by court-martial for certain offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. **Page S4090**

A motion was entered to close further debate on McCain Amendment No. 1463, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Tuesday, June 13, 2015. **Page S4087**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of McCain Amendment No. 1463. **Page S4087**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 56 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 207), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the McCain (for Burr) Modified Amendment No. 1569 (to Amendment No. 1463) (listed above). **Pages S4087–88**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that McCain (for Ernst) Amendment No. 1549 (to Amendment No. 1463) (listed above) and Reed (for Gillibrand) Amendment No. 1578 (to Amendment No. 1463) (listed above) be subject to a 60 affirmative vote threshold. **Page S4089**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, June 15, 2015, Senate resume consideration of the bill; and that the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to both the bill and to McCain Amendment No. 1463, be at 4 p.m. **Page S4117**

Signing Authority—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senator Perdue be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions. **Page S4117**

McGuire and Smith Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 5 p.m., on Monday, June 15, 2015, Senate begin consideration of the nominations of Matthew T. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote, without intervening action of debate, on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed; and that no further motions be in order to the nominations. **Page S4117**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

Douglas J. Kramer, of Kansas, to be Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration. **Pages S4070, S4118**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Brian R. Martinotti, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Robert F. Rossiter, Jr., of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska. **Pages S4117–18**

Messages from the House: **Page S4103**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4104–05**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4105–10**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4101–02**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4110–15**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Pages S4115–16**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S4116**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S4116**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—207) **Page S4088**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:19 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, June

15, 2015. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4117.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

An original bill (S.1558) entitled, "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016";

An original bill entitled, "Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016"; and

An original bill entitled, "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2016".

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Ann Elizabeth Dunkin, of California, Thomas A. Burke, of Maryland, and Jane Toshiko Nishida, of Maryland, who was introduced by Senator Cardin,

each to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

FEDERAL AGENCY WHISTLEBLOWERS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine accounts of current and former federal agency whistleblowers, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant Colonel Jason Amerine, USA; Taylor Johnson, Senior Special Agent, Office of Investigations, and Jose Rafael Ducos, Chief Officer, Customs and Border Protection, both of the Department of Homeland Security; Michael James Keegan, former Associate Commissioner, Facilities and Supply Management, Department of Budget, Finance, and Management, Social Security Administration; and Thomas Devine, Government Accountability Project, Washington, D.C.

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. 2728–2744; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 309 were introduced. **Pages H4241–42**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H4243**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 160, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–147);

H.R. 1615, to direct the Chief FOIA Officer of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in the implementation of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–148); and

H.R. 1637, to require annual reports on the activities and accomplishments of federally funded research and development centers within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 114–149). **Page H4241**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Duncan (TN) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4163**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:56 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4169**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a recorded vote of 239 ayes to 172 noes with one answering "present", Roll No. 360. **Pages H4169, H4236–37**

Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015—Order of Business: Agreed by unanimous consent that the order of the House of June 10, 2015, regarding consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 1295, be modified by striking "printed" and inserting "submitted for printing". **Page H4172**

Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015: The House agreed to the Ryan (WI) motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the title of H.R. 1295 and concur in the Senate amendment to the text of H.R. 1295 with an amendment numbered 1 printed in the Congressional Record, by a yea-and-nay vote of 397 yeas to 32 nays, Roll No. 345. **Pages H4194–H4218**

Senate amendments were considered pursuant to the order of the House of June 10, 2015, as modified by the order of the House of today. **Page H4172**

Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016: The House passed H.R. 2685, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, by a yea-and-nay vote of 278 yeas to 149 nays, Roll No. 358. Consideration began yesterday, June 10th.

Pages H4172, H4218–27

Rejected the Moulton motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 186 yeas to 240 noes, Roll No. 357. **Pages H4225–27**

Agreed to:

Massie amendment that was debated on June 10th that prohibits the use of funds for Section 702 programs of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (by a recorded vote of 255 yeas to 174 noes, Roll No. 356). **Pages H4224–25**

Rejected:

Schiff amendment that was debated on June 10th that sought to prohibit the use of funds after March 31, 2016, for Operation Inherent Resolve in the absence of a law enacted by Congress before such date that specifically authorizes the use of military force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (by a recorded vote of 196 yeas to 231 noes, Roll No. 346); **Pages H4218–19**

Lee amendment that was debated on June 10th that sought to prohibit the use of funds pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force after December 31, 2015 (by a recorded vote of 157 yeas to 270 noes, Roll No. 347); **Page H4219**

Lee amendment that was debated on June 10th that sought to prohibit the use of funds pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (by a recorded vote of 165 yeas to 264 noes, Roll No. 348); **Pages H4219–20**

Sablan amendment that was debated on June 10th that sought to prohibit the use of funds to establish any live-fire range, training course, or maneuver area within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (by a recorded vote of 173 yeas to 256 noes, Roll No. 349); **Page H4220**

Gosar amendment that was debated on June 10th that sought to prohibit the use of funds by the Department of the Navy to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, any search and rescue units from the Marine Corps (by a recorded vote of 81 yeas to 347 noes, Roll No. 350); **Page H4221**

Johnson (GA) amendment that was debated on June 10th that sought to prohibit the use of funds

to transfer a flash-bang grenade (by a recorded vote of 165 yeas to 265 noes, Roll No. 351); **Pages H4221–22**

Gosar amendment that was debated on June 10th that sought to prohibit the use of funds to procure any Army Aircrew Combat Uniforms (by a recorded vote of 51 yeas to 378 noes, Roll No. 352); **Page H4222**

Johnson (GA) amendment that was debated on June 10th that sought to prohibit the use of funds to transfer a mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle (by a recorded vote of 166 yeas to 262 noes, Roll No. 353); **Page H4223**

Ellison amendment that was debated on June 10th that sought to prohibit the use of funds to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term “Fair Labor Standards Act” and such disposition is listed as “willful” or “repeated” (by a recorded vote of 187 yeas to 242 noes, Roll No. 354); and **Pages H4223–24**

Smith (MO) amendment that was debated on June 10th that sought to prohibit the use of funds to provide for defense counsel for any individual described in section 8101(c) (by a recorded vote of 133 yeas to 297 noes, Roll No. 355). **Page H4224**

H. Res. 303, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2685) and (H.R. 2393), was agreed to yesterday, June 10th.

Trade Act of 2015 and Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015—Rule for consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 305, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) and the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 644), by a yea-and-nay vote of 217 yeas to 212 nays, Roll No. 359. **Pages H4227–36**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H4227.

Senate Referral: S. 253 was held at the desk. **Page H4227**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and thirteen recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4217–18, H4218, H4219, H4219–20, H4220, H4221, H4221–22, H4222, H4223, H4223–24, H4224, H4225, H4226–27, H4227, H4236, H4236–37. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

Committee Meetings

IMPLEMENTING THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014: CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry held a hearing entitled “Implementing the Agricultural Act of 2014: Conservation Programs”. Testimony was heard from Jason Weller, Chief, Natural Resource Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; Val Dolcini, Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a markup on the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill. The Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for FY 2016. The State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for FY 2016 was ordered reported, as amended.

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE VIEWS ON THE MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION’S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MILITARY HEALTH CARE REFORM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled “The Department of Defense Views on the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission’s Recommendations for Military Health Care Reform”. Testimony was heard from Jonathan Woodson, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, Department of Defense; Lieutenant General Patricia D. Horoho, Surgeon General, Army; Lieutenant General Mark A. Ediger, Surgeon General, Air Force; and Rear Admiral C. Forrest Faison, III, MC, USN, Deputy Surgeon General, Navy.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Examining H.R. 1786, James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Reauthorization Act”. Testimony was heard from John Howard, Director, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health; and public witnesses.

THE FUTURE OF HOUSING IN AMERICA: OVERSIGHT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Future of Housing in America: Oversight of the Department of Housing and Urban Development”. Testimony was heard from Julian Castro, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

EXAMINING LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO PRESERVE CONSUMER CHOICE AND FINANCIAL INDEPENDENCE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing entitled “Examining Legislative Proposals to Preserve Consumer Choice and Financial Independence”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

RETREAT OR REVIVAL: A STATUS REPORT ON DEMOCRACY IN ASIA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing entitled “Retreat or Revival: A Status Report on Democracy in Asia”. Testimony was heard from Tom Malinowski, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Department of State; Jonathan Stivers, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Asia, U.S. Agency for International Development; Scot Marciel, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

THE GOLDMAN ACT TO RETURN ABDUCTED AMERICAN CHILDREN: ASSESSING THE COMPLIANCE REPORT AND REQUIRED ACTION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled “The Goldman Act to Return Abducted American Children: Assessing the Compliance Report and Required Action”. Testimony was heard from Karen Christensen, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State; Henry Hand, Director, Office of Children’s Issues, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 9, the “Innovation Act”. H.R. 9 was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 387, the “Economic Development Through Tribal Land Exchange Act”;

H.R. 521, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska; H.R. 1289, the “John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act”; H.R. 1992, the “American Soda Ash Competitiveness Act”; H.R. 2295, the “National Energy Security Corridors Act”; H.R. 2358, the “Electricity Reliability and Forest Protection Act”; and H.R. 2647, the “Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015”. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 521, H.R. 1289, H.R. 2295, H.R. 2358, and H.R. 2647. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 387 and H.R. 1992.

EXAMINING FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE AT THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Health Care, Benefits and Administrative Rules held a hearing entitled “Examining Fraud, Waste, and Abuse at the Export-Import Bank”. Testimony was heard from Mike McCarthy, Acting Inspector General, Export-Import Bank, Office of the Inspector General.

TRANSFORMING AMERICA’S AIR TRAVEL

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space held a hearing entitled “Transforming America’s Air Travel”. Testimony was heard from Jaiwon Shin, Associate Administrator, Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Member, Federal Aviation Administration Research and Development Advisory Committee; Dennis Filler, Director, William J. Hughes Technical Center, Federal Aviation Administration; and public witnesses.

SQUEEZED: CURRENT CHALLENGES FOR SMALL CITRUS OPERATIONS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade held a hearing entitled

“Squeezed: Current Challenges for Small Citrus Operations”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXPLORING VBA’S FIDUCIARY PROGRAM

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a hearing entitled “Exploring VBA’s Fiduciary Program”. Testimony was heard from David R. McLenachen, Acting Deputy Under Secretary for Disability Assistance, Director, Pension and Fiduciary Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Gary Abe, Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Audits and Evaluations, Office of Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing entitled “EPA’s Proposed Ozone Rule”, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Oversight Failures Behind the Radiological Incident at DOE’s Waste Isolation Pilot Plant”, 9:45 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled “U.S. Surface Transportation: Technology Driving the Future”, 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, June 15

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1735, National Defense Authorization Act. The filing deadline for all first-degree amendments to both the bill and to McCain Amendment No. 1463, will be at 4 p.m.

At 5 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of Matthew T. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service, and vote on confirmation of the nominations at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, June 12

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1314—Trade Act of 2015 (Subject to a Rule). Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendments with a House Amendment to H.R. 644—Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Babin, Brian, Tex., E877
 Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E881
 Bost, Mike, Ill., E883
 Brady, Kevin, Tex., E882
 Carter, Earl L. "Buddy", Ga., E880
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E880
 Cook, Paul, Calif., E886
 Costa, Jim, Calif., E882
 Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E879
 Fincher, Stephen Lee, Tenn., E877, E879

Foster, Bill, Ill., E883
 Green, Gene, Tex., E880
 Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E884
 Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E881, E885
 Kind, Ron, Wisc., E877
 Kline, John, Minn., E879
 Messer, Luke, Ind., E882
 Norcross, Donald, N.J., E879, E884
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E881, E885
 Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E883
 Poe, Ted, Tex., E880, E883

Radewagen, Aumua Amata Coleman, American Samoa, E885
 Reed, Tom, N.Y., E882
 Rouzer, David, N.C., E877
 Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E878
 Scott, Austin, Ga., E878
 Smith, Jason, Mo., E879, E882, E883, E884
 Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E884
 Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E883
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E877
 Yoho, Ted S., Fla., E878



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.