



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 2016

No. 113

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 13, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

FREE OSCAR LOPEZ RIVERA

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, I will not be on vacation or traveling on junkets to far-off lands during the next 6 or 8 weeks that Congress is in recess because I am going to be involved in a campaign to free Oscar Lopez Rivera from incarceration.

Oscar Lopez Rivera is regarded as the last political prisoner from Puerto Rico that is still being held in a Federal penitentiary. Oscar is a friend and a mentor. And at 73 years old, he is not

beaten, broken, or sad, as you can see by the smile on his face.

Even after spending 35 years in jail, nearly half of his life, he is a hero to many people in Puerto Rico and throughout the Puerto Rico diaspora. It warms my heart that people from every walk of life now understand that the 35 years Oscar has served for crimes that were not violent is too long to be in jail. There is a groundswell of support to tell President Obama that, after 35 years, it is time to let Oscar Lopez Rivera come home to his family, his island, and his community.

Enough is enough—ya basta. Thirty-five years is enough. And this comes from people of every political background: conservatives, liberals, statehooders, Democrats, Republicans, Populares, and, yes, those who believe in independence like I do. And every generation from the youngest, hippest kids, like Residente of Calle 13, to old people like me, from the richest to the poorest, whether you live in Bayamon, Ponce, Orlando, Chicago, or New York City, the Puerto Rican people are united in our call to free Oscar Lopez Rivera.

Internationally, Bishop Desmond Tutu is with us, and a long list of Nobel Peace Prize winners have joined the campaign to free Oscar Lopez, along with world leaders, community leaders, and average people across Europe, Latin America, and the world.

Oscar Lopez is a decorated Vietnam war veteran, a father, teacher, mentor, and a friend. Yet, he has languished in Terre Haute, Indiana, for three-and-a-half decades.

President Obama has less than 200 days left as President, and the chorus of supporters for the freedom of Oscar Lopez Rivera will continue to call on the President every day to release our brother Oscar back to our community so he can live out his days in peace and with his family. Commutation is the only option—the only option.

It will be a minimum of 10 years before Oscar can talk—that is just talk—to a parole board. It is now or never, and President Obama holds all the cards. We could not allow Oscar to die in jail. Obama must commute his sentence.

A coalition, La Coalicion por la Liberacion de Oscar Lopez Rivera, has formed with lawyers, union leaders, elected officials, community leaders, and citizens from every walk of life in Puerto Rico and wherever Puerto Ricans live in the United States. This coalition just announced a unity event, a gathering in Lafayette Square across the street from the White House, on October 9, 2016.

So, Madam Speaker, when the Congress leaves this week for 6 weeks or more, I am not going to go on vacation. I am going to go work to build awareness about Oscar Lopez Rivera and build awareness about October 9 right here in Washington, D.C., at Lafayette Square.

The 9th of October in Washington—el 9 de octubre en Washington. We all have to show up and show our support for Oscar and his family.

So I will be in Lorain, Ohio, this Saturday and in Philadelphia and New Jersey later this month. I will be in Puerto Rico and California. Wherever I go, I will be telling people to come to Washington to show support for Oscar Lopez Rivera on October 9, 2016. If you live in New York, it is about a 3½ hour drive to D.C. Oscar Lopez Rivera has been in jail for three-and-a-half decades, so I don't want to hear any excuses.

October 9th is a Sunday. So if you live anywhere up and down the eastern seaboard, you can go to sunrise service at your church and still make it in time to show your solidarity with Oscar.

If you live in Chicago or Orlando, okay, it is going to take you a little longer. You might even have to pay for

□ 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.

H4817

a hotel or airplane ticket, but your Boricua nation needs you to represent.

I ask everyone who is watching today or who sees my remarks online to commit yourself to joining me and others in Lafayette Square on October 9 in Washington, D.C. It is up to us. It is up to you.

President Obama has done so much to address injustice, to address unfair prison sentences for nonviolent offenses, to address the inherent injustice that all too often characterizes our system of justice. I thank him and praise him for that.

In this case, with this elder statesman of the Puerto Rican diaspora for this nonviolent, exemplary inmate, for this father and war hero, for Oscar Lopez Rivera, we respectfully say enough is enough—ya basta. Free Oscar Lopez Rivera.

26TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

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

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 26th anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Twenty-six years ago this month, this landmark legislation was put into effect to eliminate discrimination against individuals with disabilities. This month, organizations and advocacy groups across my district in central New York are coordinating events to recognize this milestone and the significance of the ADA to so many in our community.

In my district, ARISE—the designated independent living center for Cayuga, Onondaga, and Oswego Counties—is vital to our local efforts to ensure that people of all abilities live fully integrated and self-directed lives. ARISE provides an array of services to assist central New Yorkers, including my brother-in-law, with disabilities and to help ensure that our local communities are inclusive for people of all abilities.

While the ADA has been in law for 26 years now, our work in Congress continues today. I am a proud cosponsor of the IDEA Full Funding Act to help remove barriers for children with disabilities and to expand special education services. And I will continue to be supportive of efforts in the House to ensure people with all abilities are provided opportunities and independence.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, 3 weeks ago today, House Democrats conducted a sit-in to demand a commonsense debate and votes on gun violence. Americans gath-

ered around their televisions, computers, and phones and rooted for this Congress to do the right thing.

Across the country, families demanded that this body take up two commonsense measures to reduce our country's epidemic of gun violence. Phones in our offices throughout Capitol Hill were ringing off the hook. Thousands of Americans—students, teachers, grieving parents, strangers to the political process—saw something that inspired and excited them, and they picked up the phone because they had hope. Their message: Thank you for fighting for us. Make sure something is done.

What did this Congress do with that hope? Well, instead of allowing a vote to expand background checks to keep Americans safe, instead of allowing a vote to close the terrorist gun loophole, instead of even having a debate on gun safety, the Speaker turned his back on the American people and sent the House home early.

Since Orlando, hundreds have died from gun violence. Just in the streets of Chicago, more than 300 people have been hurt or killed by guns in the last month. An average of 91 Americans are killed every day by guns.

There was a time when unthinkable violence and mass shootings shook our Nation to its core, and our elected leaders would find a way to bring us together like the bipartisan calls we heard for unity in Dallas yesterday. They would struggle to get it right, but ultimately they would and save lives.

It happened 82 years ago with the New Deal for Crime. It happened 48 years ago with major gun violence reforms. And it happened 23 years ago when Americans stood up to the powerful gun lobby and passed the Brady Handgun Violence Program. Each time, a frustrated, grieving, but determined Nation took a stand together to say enough is enough.

It has been 23 years since our country passed any meaningful gun violence legislation. Since then, gun-related crimes have claimed more American lives than AIDS, war, and illegal drug overdoses combined. Since Newtown, tens of thousands of lives have been lost to this deadly crisis. The number of bills that have been debated and passed by this Congress to prevent these deaths remains at zero.

This Republican Congress may find comfort in remaining silent, in doing the bidding of the NRA, in turning its back on our people. But our inaction disserves our constituents and the tens of thousands of families who have lost loved ones to gun violence. Millions more worry that they and their families are not safe. And if mothers can't sleep at night knowing their children are safe from harm, neither should this Congress.

I challenge my colleagues who have been silent on gun violence to engage their communities when they go home, to try and find a way to reject the gun lobby's heavy hand and bring the will

of the American people to this body and to help us reduce gun fatalities.

The number of Americans who are resolved to taking steps to reduce gun violence is growing. I ask my colleagues to take stock of their solemn duty to keep families safe from harm. I ask them to take stock of history. Do not bet against the American people. Stand with us to end Congress' deadly silence.

INEQUITABLE BUSINESS PRACTICE IN AUSTRALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, last year, I spoke on the House floor about my serious concerns about the Export-Import Bank's interference of energy companies and the country of Australia.

In 2013, the Export-Import Bank approved a loan of \$640 million in financing for U.S. equipment to develop an open-pit iron ore mine in Australia. The mine is owned by the wealthiest woman in Australia. This is not an appropriate use of U.S. taxpayer dollars.

According to unions, public officials, and the Iron Mining Association, these subsidies threaten to displace nearly \$600 million worth of U.S. iron ore exports and cause a reduction of \$1.2 billion in domestic sales.

Today, injustice toward U.S. companies in Australia has been continued regarding a Florida company, APR. APR constructed an \$80 million power plant in western Australia to help the people and businesses of western Australia.

Once the power-generation facility was almost built, an Australian bank, ANZ Bank, seized the power plant, even though it had no legal title or ownership interest in the plant. It claimed an ownership interest in the plant based on an unfair law in Australia which is unique to that country. This incredibly unfair Australian legislation allows U.S. companies and U.S. banks to lose their title or lien interest to their own assets, even though the Australian companies and banks are expressly barred from doing so by contracts they signed with U.S. companies.

APR lost its \$80 million power plant, lost the use of equipment and ability to generate electricity for western Australians, and lost the revenue associated with the plant. That power plant and revenue was wrongfully taken by the bank.

Australia legislates that U.S. companies that lease assets in Australia are at peril of losing their assets based on this unfair and inequitable law. This law is called the Personal Property Securities Act and is contrary to the basic right to own and possess private property guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution and the fundamental right to due process and equal protection, also guaranteed under the U.S.

Constitution. This law has the demonstrated ability, such as with APR, and the potential to seriously harm many other U.S. businesses and U.S. interests in Australia and must be immediately addressed.

□ 1015

Last night I conducted a telephone townhall meeting in my district and was asked by a constituent about the status of the Trans-Pacific Partnership legislation. This matter is important and topical for us because of the pending Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement which the Obama administration is supporting and many in Congress are pushing for a vote on soon, such as this year.

Laws like the Australian Personal Property Securities Act should make it very difficult for any Member of Congress to vote for the Trans-Pacific Partnership. If Australia is going to continue to be our trading partner, there must be a level playing field for all parties involved. U.S. companies cannot be at a disadvantage when they do business in Australia or any other country.

I strongly encourage our U.S. Trade Representative to address the situation so an inequity caused to APR and the potential inequities presented for other U.S. companies be corrected before a vote is called on the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

COMMEMORATING OFFICER BRENT THOMPSON

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Madam Speaker, to protect and serve isn't just a slogan on the side of police cars all across the country. It is a promise—a promise that our men and women in blue keep every day as they serve to uphold the law and order in our cities and our towns. Without their bravery and sacrifice, our communities would be lawless and our families, our friends, and our loved ones would be in constant danger.

I can't adequately express the sadness I felt last week when five Dallas police officers were targeted as victims in a horrific ambush simply for choosing to put on their uniform and to protect their community. Among the officers whose lives were unjustly taken was DART Police Department Officer Brent Thompson, who was a resident of Royse City in my home district. It just breaks my heart that this brave man's life was mercilessly and needlessly cut short at 43 years of age just because he reported for duty simply wanting to do his job.

So I join the greater Dallas community, the Fourth District of Texas, and our entire country in mourning over the loss of Officer Thompson, as we remember him for his selfless commitment to our country. His family remains in our prayers, and we will be forever grateful to him for his service.

Officer Thompson, you will not be forgotten. Your memory will continue to inspire us to stand up for those who stand up for us because this violence targeted towards our police officers is unacceptable, it is outrageous, and it needs to stop.

RAISING ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, every month should be Alzheimer's & Brain Awareness Month, and I rise today to share my efforts to help Alzheimer's patients and their families. Having lost my mother due to complications from Alzheimer's, I am all too familiar with how it impacts the patient and their loved ones.

I continue to push for more NIH research funding because it represents our best chance to save lives and restore hope to millions of families. I am a cosponsor of Congressman ELIOT ENGEL's Palliative Care and Hospice Education and Training Act, a bill to make sure that Alzheimer's patients receive the care and the compassion they deserve and they need.

I am also a cosponsor of Congressman CHRIS SMITH's HOPE for Alzheimer's Act, to help families and caregivers plan for the costs and complications of Alzheimer's.

I urge all of my colleagues and the public to join together with the Alzheimer's Association in supporting these efforts to fight this tragic disease.

SUPPORTING PEOPLE WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISORDERS THROUGH NATURE LINKS

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the efforts that the one nonprofit organization that is based in my south Florida district is making on behalf of young adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Nature Links for Lifelong Learning is forming a valuable national model of education and inclusion for south Florida. For far too long, many young adults with an autism spectrum disorder, Asperger's, or Down syndrome have been forgotten as they were released into the world following their time in the public school system, but Nature Links has exceptional skills-based educational training which works to identify the character of each individual's unique identity and takes the time to tap into each student's potential to develop civically engaged, job-ready, and fully functioning adults.

I congratulate Nature Links on its contributions to our south Florida community, and I urge everyone to learn more by visiting their Web site at www.naturelinks.net.

CELEBRATING VIZCAYA'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in celebration of the 100th anniversary

of the completion of the main house at Vizcaya on the shores of Biscayne Bay in my fabulous south Florida congressional district.

Since 1916, Vizcaya has served as a south Florida landmark and a symbol of Old World elegance and cultural influence. Unfortunately, James Deering, the former vice president of International Harvester and the visionary founder of Vizcaya, died in 1925 before his plans for the estate were completed in full.

Now, as part of the Miami-Dade County Parks system, the Vizcaya Museum and Gardens preserves some of south Florida's early history among significant collections of orchid specimens and European artwork.

With plans to continue historic preservation and the creation of an attractive new open space for public enjoyment to be known as Vizcaya Village, the future beyond 100 is indeed very bright for Vizcaya.

EXCITING RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the outstanding contributions that the University of Miami researchers are making to America's health care. In becoming one of the leading research universities in the country over the last decade, the University of Miami has developed a pool of world-class talent and advanced infrastructure that is helping lead the science and tech boom that is shaping south Florida's future for the better.

Among the exciting research breakthroughs taking place in Coral Gables is the work of the Lampidis lab at the Miller School of Medicine. This is where Dr. Lampidis and his associates have found that, when given in combination with a common cholesterol medication, nontoxic 2-DG therapy effectively kills tumors without the use of harsh, conventional chemotherapy drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Dr. Lampidis and everyone at the University of Miami for their efforts to improve our community, our Nation, and the world.

THE PATH FORWARD ON GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I come today to draw attention to the fact that tomorrow evening we are going to be hosting a SpeakOut on the west front of the Capitol, the west lawn, and we are going to be highlighting four pieces of legislation: H.R. 1217, H.R. 1076, H.R. 3051, and H.R. 4603.

I am particularly interested today in H.R. 3051. That is the legislation that seeks to close what has become known as the Charleston loophole. The reason I am particularly interested in it today is because yesterday the General Accountability Office issued a 57-page report. Now, that report is so voluminous

I am not going to ask that it be entered into the RECORD, but I will include the one-page summary into the RECORD. Here is what you are going to find in this report:

[From GAO Highlights, July 2016]

GUN CONTROL

ANALYZING AVAILABLE DATA COULD HELP IMPROVE BACKGROUND CHECKS INVOLVING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE RECORDS

What GAO Found

Most of the 50 states submit domestic violence records—misdemeanor crime of domestic violence (MCDV) convictions and domestic violence protection orders—to the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for use during National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) checks, but states vary in their efforts to identify ("flag") such records that prohibit an individual from obtaining a firearm under federal law. For example, in 2015, 22 states voluntarily participated in a program to identify criminal history records that prohibit individuals from obtaining firearms, which can include domestic violence records. FBI data also show that 47 states identified domestic violence protection orders that prohibit firearm purchases. Since not all domestic violence records that states submit to the FBI meet federal prohibiting criteria, flagging prohibiting records can help expedite NICS checks. The total number of prohibiting domestic violence records that states submit to the FBI is generally unknown because states are not required to flag prohibiting records and there is no automated process to disaggregate such records from other records checked by NICS.

For fiscal years 2006 to 2015, FBI data show that most NICS checks involving domestic violence records that resulted in denials were completed before firearm transfers took place (see table). However, about 6,700 firearms were transferred to individuals with prohibiting domestic violence records, which resulted in the FBI referring these cases to DOJ's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives for firearm retrieval. Under federal law, firearm dealers may (but are not required to) transfer a firearm to an individual if the dealer has not received a response (proceed or denial) from the FBI after 3 business days.

BACKGROUND CHECK DENIALS AND FIREARM TRANSFERS FOR MISDEMEANOR CRIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (MCDV) CONVICTIONS AND PROTECTION ORDERS, FISCAL YEARS 2006 TO 2015

Category—MCDV convictions, Total denials—59,000, Within 3 days—41,000, After 3 days—18,000, Firearm transfers—6,221.

Category—Protection Orders, Total denials—30,000, Within 3 days—28,000, After 3 days—2,000, Firearm transfers—559.

FBI data also show that during fiscal year 2015, the FBI completed 90 percent of denials that involved MCDV convictions within 7 business days, which was longer than for any other prohibiting category (e.g., felony convictions). The FBI completed 90 percent of denials that involved domestic violence protection orders in fewer than 3 business days. According to federal and selected state officials GAO contacted, the information needed to determine whether domestic violence records—and in particular MCDV convictions—meet the criteria to prohibit a firearm transfer is not always readily available in NICS databases and can require additional outreach to state agencies to obtain information. DOJ has taken steps to help states make prohibiting information more readily available to NICS—such as through training and grant programs—but does not monitor

the timeliness of checks that result in denials by prohibiting category. Ongoing monitoring could help the FBI determine if specific prohibiting categories present greater challenges in making determinations than other categories and, in turn, the FBI could provide the results to other DOJ entities to help them establish priorities, such as for grants, state outreach, or training.

GAO HIGHLIGHTS

Highlights of GAO-16-483, a report to the Acting Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Why GAO Did This Study

The FBI and designated state and local criminal justice agencies use the FBI's NICS to conduct background checks on individuals seeking to obtain firearms. Persons prohibited by federal law from possessing firearms include individuals who have domestic violence records that meet federal disqualifying criteria. Under federal law, firearm dealers may transfer a firearm to an individual if the FBI has not made a proceed or denial determination within 3 business days.

GAO was asked to review NICS checks involving domestic violence records. This report (1) describes the extent to which states identify domestic violence records that prohibit an individual from obtaining a firearm and (2) evaluates the extent to which NICS checks involving domestic violence records are completed before firearm transfers take place and any related challenges in completing these checks.

GAO reviewed laws and regulations; analyzed FBI data from 2006 through 2015 on domestic violence records that states submitted to the FBI, FBI total checks and denial determinations, and DOJ firearm retrieval actions; and interviewed officials from DOJ and eight states (chosen based on number of domestic violence records submitted to NICS and other factors). State interview results are not generalizable but provide insights on state practices.

What GAO Recommends

GAO recommends that FBI monitor the timeliness of NICS checks to assist DOJ entities in establishing priorities for improving the timeliness of checks. FBI agreed with the recommendation.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this report says that the General Accountability Office has found that between the years 2006 and 2015, 89,000 people have been blocked from purchasing weapons who were not eligible to purchase weapons because of their records.

But the report says that 6,800 others were able to purchase firearms because the 3-day limit expired before they had the chance to complete the background checks. That is what happened to those nine souls at Emanuel AME Church when the gentleman, if I might call him that, who purchased a weapon and murdered those nine people was not eligible to purchase a weapon. He was joined by 6,800 others.

Now, we have heard from people who tell us—and this report says—that this is the biggest contributor to domestic violence. 6,800 people who have been convicted of domestic violence were able to go and purchase guns simply because of this loophole.

We have been asking for years now that the Centers for Disease Control be authorized to go and study this issue to

help better inform us on the impact of gun violence, but this House has passed prohibitive legislation that will not allow funds to be used to do that study.

I don't quite understand. Why is it not proper for the Members of the United States Congress to be equipped with information that will allow us to make better decisions about how to protect the American people?

People who are guilty of domestic violence and have been proven in the courts to be guilty ought to not be allowed to go onto the Internet and purchase a weapon. We have case after case where these weapons were then almost immediately used to injure, maim, and, in some instances, kill wives, spouses, and children because of this loophole.

I would have hoped that after June 17 of last year that we would come to our senses in this body and close this loophole, but tomorrow evening we are going to once again draw attention to this loophole because the American people are deserving of being protected by those of us who are elected to protect them, secure them, and to make sure that they can live out their lives in security.

ALL EDUCATION IS CAREER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for far too long there has been a discrepancy in what students are learning in the classroom and what employers say they need in the workplace. The passage of the bipartisan Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act in 2014 was an important step for the millions of Americans who are looking for work and for the employers who have job opportunities that remain unfilled due to the skills gap. However, great jobs are still going unfilled. Americans are still missing out on rewarding careers, and many businesses are still suffering.

The Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act has provided Federal support to State and local career and technical education programs for more than 30 years. H.R. 5587, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, updates the law to reflect today's economic needs and the challenges that students and workers currently face.

In particular, I am pleased that the bill streamlines the number of performance measures for postsecondary programs and aligns them with the performance measures in WIOA, retaining that law's precedent-setting accountability standards that let taxpayers and lawmakers see clearly which programs work and which programs don't. This bipartisan bill goes a long way toward ensuring that individuals who pursue a technical education have the knowledge and skills they need to succeed.

□ 1030

However, I believe it is time we acknowledge that all education is career education and stop dividing the path to a high school degree into two tracks.

Students pursue education to develop the necessary skills to find a job—preferably a career—in a chosen field. It is the same objective, whether the student is pursuing a medical degree at an Ivy League university or taking automotive performance courses at the local community college.

Unfortunately, there is an unnecessary stigma attached to career and technical education. It is too often referred to as the “other” track, with the incorrect implication that it is the path individuals take if they won’t be able to handle the rigors of college.

In reality, students who pursue CTE complete a diverse curriculum where they learn important skills for succeeding in the workplace, such as problem solving, research, time management, and critical thinking. They are more engaged, perform better, and graduate at higher rates than their college-bound counterparts. We should be celebrating that success and studying how we can translate it across the board.

As long as we have two educational tracks, we have a problem in the way people perceive those who choose career and technical education. We need to shift our perspective away from the idea that every student must attend an expansive and expensive 4-year program to succeed in the workforce. Educational success is about more than just a degree. It is about quantifiable skills that employers need in their employees.

WOLVES IN THE WEST

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, here we are, doing so-called morning-hour debate after a very late evening here in the House doing a pretend bill. We are providing the very similitude of a representative Congress by having endless series of votes on bills that are going nowhere in the appropriations process because the Senate isn’t doing appropriations bills. Everyone knows there will be some gigantic omnibus or continuing resolution year-end deal. Nonetheless, to make it look like we are actually doing something, instead of taking up issues, as mentioned by Mr. CLYBURN earlier, we are holding endless vote series and then debate late at night.

At 1:45 a.m. the gentleman from Washington introduced an amendment to remove all protections for wolves in the United States of America. Now, of course, wolves only occupy a tiny fraction of their range. He did this under strong urging from the cattlemen and some hunting groups. There is only one thing wrong with what he is doing. It is actually going to have a countereffect.

The wolf predation on cattle is unbelievably insignificant. 7.8 percent of the losses of cattle are due to disease and weather. Better husbandry would help a lot with the cattlemen. And then, 2.7 percent is due to other predators, principally, coyotes, who the animal damage control and wildlife services people have been trying to extirpate for 70 years. Well, 70 years after they tried to eliminate all the coyotes in America, there are many more coyotes much more widely dispersed across the country, and there are huge packs in the West which do predate on cattle.

Now, why is it a problem if they want to kill off the wolves?

Well, wolves eat and kill coyotes. Here is a predator that does not prefer cattle; it prefers wild game. In fact, wolves do help also with wild game. They aren’t trophy hunters. They aren’t going after the 50-point elk. They are going to go after the slowest and weakest that are out there, or caribou up in Alaska.

They actually improve the health of the herds, but the hunters say: Wait a minute. They are killing some of our elk. We should be killing the elk.

But the hunters are going after the trophies. The wolves aren’t going after the trophies. So you are doing exactly the wrong, stupid thing here.

I think a majority of the American people, as indicated by the 1.2 million comments against delisting the wolf submitted to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, would agree that we want to restore ecosystems and make them more healthy.

Look at Yellowstone. Since the wolves have come back into Yellowstone, the park has changed dramatically for the better. The elk herds don’t just hang around now down in the rivers and eat all of the riparian vegetation and ruin the water quality. They have got to act more like elk and hide out in the forest. If they make themselves into targets, they are going to get eaten. So the health of the park has improved unbelievably due to the presence of wolves.

This is a keystone species in a natural order. And because of this horrible depredation, this 0.9 percent loss due to wolves, compared to almost 10 times that due to bad husbandry practices, the answer is: Kill the wolves.

We have got a 2.7 loss due to coyotes and other predators who actually are targeted by the wolves. The answer is: Kill the wolves.

This is stupid, irrational, unscientific. In fact, there is a study from the University of Washington that found killing wolves actually increased livestock losses.

The gentleman from Washington wants to persist in the myth that somehow, by eliminating wolves, it will help the livestock industry. It is just yet another misbegotten amendment on a fake bill that isn’t going anywhere, but I would still urge my colleagues to vote against it.

1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 1-year anniversary of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the so-called Iran nuclear deal.

President Obama made a series of promises to the American people. One was that Iran would cease its illicit nuclear activity. And yet, last week, Mr. Speaker, Germany reported that Iran has increased its illegal proliferation of nuclear technology.

President Obama also promised that the nuclear deal would moderate Iran. In other words, there was a gentle, nice Iran that was waiting to come out, if only we would be more understanding. But in the past year, the Islamic Republic has launched nuclear ballistic missiles in violation of U.N. security resolutions, kidnapped U.S. sailors, shot rockets within 1,500 yards of U.S. Navy ships, and increased their support for terror regimes and terror groups, and remain the world’s largest state sponsor of terrorism.

The President also stated that the U.S. sanctions regime would stay in place against Iran’s terror activity while it was being lifted against the nuclear activity.

But, instead, the U.S. has become Iran’s negotiator in chief on the world stage and has rewarded companies that continue to support the Iranian National Guard Core and is devising ways to give Iran access to the U.S. financial system.

One year after the President agreed to a dangerous nuclear deal, Iran continues to be a major adversary. Congress needs to highlight and spotlight Iran’s malevolent activity. The good news is Congress is doing just that, Mr. Speaker.

I am encouraged that the House will take up three very important pieces of legislation. It will deal with the heavy water bill.

Think about this. Iran gets caught manufacturing heavy water. Rather than calling out the Iranian regime, in clear violation of the nuclear deal, what does the administration do?

The administration says: Well, we are going to help Iran comply with the deal that they have just violated by using United States taxpayer money to buy the heavy water from Iran.

You can’t make this up. It is so absurd. We are only given excuses. We have got to focus in on what else is happening on this issue.

Now, Boeing and Airbus have failed to understand the deep risks that come from doing business with Iran. These aren’t necessarily risks for their bottom line. They are very willing to sell to a terrorist regime. But they are risks to freedom-loving people around the world.

Both Airbus and Boeing want to do what?

They want to sell a product that can be used for terrorism. They can use airlines for the purpose of moving things into illicit areas.

We all know that Iran Air was sanctioned for ferrying weapons and troops to rogue regimes and terrorist groups. We know that Iran Air was implicated in North Korea's ballistic missile tests. And we also know that Iran systematically uses their commercial aircraft to transport weapons, troops, missiles, cash, and other supplies to terror groups.

Mr. Speaker, on my left is a display. This is a computer printout that shows a flight from Tehran to Damascus last week. Now, think about this. This is the hubris of the Iranian regime: the Iranian Air Force flying a Boeing 747 in the middle of the night from Tehran to Damascus.

Do we think that this is for commercial purposes? Of course, not.

Did we think that this is for tourism? Of course, not.

Do we think that they are flying baby formula or textbooks? Of course, not.

What they are doing is a bad act, and we ought to not be complicit in this.

Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago, this House passed, on a bipartisan basis, limitations to the Financial Services Appropriations bill that would prevent this sale. And we did it by voice vote. What a voice vote means is that nobody substantially rose in opposition.

Why? Because there is no real reason to rise because more and more people are recognizing that these types of sales should not go through.

In response, the CEO of Boeing, Dennis Muilenburg, essentially said: Well, look, us selling to Iran is a good business opportunity to do business with the Iranians.

And then he also said: Well, if Boeing can't sell, then nobody else should be able to sell.

But did you notice something, Mr. Speaker, in those two comments?

He didn't say: Look, we have got this under control. He didn't say: We are positive that nothing is going to be used for terrorism. He didn't say that this wouldn't jeopardize national security. He just said: If we can't do it, nobody should be able to do it.

Look, I agree, if Boeing can't do it, nobody should be able to do it. It is well known that all of Boeing's competitors—Airbus of France, Bombardier of Canada, Embraer from Brazil, Comac from China—each of these companies sources at least 10 percent of their components from the United States. They require the same license that Boeing does.

But that is not the point. What we need are iconic American companies following the lead of companies like Lockheed Martin—which has said they won't pursue this—Northrop Grumman, and others that haven't sullied their reputation.

It is time for Congress to continue to do its good work.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF COACH PAT HEAD SUMMITT

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow night in my hometown of Knoxville, Tennessee, the 24,000-seat Thompson-Boling Arena will be filled with people to celebrate the life of Coach Pat Head Summitt.

Coach Summitt was buried last week in the little farming community of Henrietta, Tennessee, where she grew up. As most people know, she was diagnosed with Alzheimer's at the age of 58, 6 years ago. She fought this disease with such courage that, about 5 years ago, I had the privilege of sitting with Coach Summitt as she received the top award presented by the National Alzheimer's Association. This was the Sargent and Eunice Shriver Profiles in Dignity Award, and it was presented by their well-known daughter, Maria.

No one could have been more deserving of this award than Coach Summitt. She made the decision to both go public with this diagnosis and continue coaching her beloved Lady Vols. Later, she decided to give up her coaching job after 38 years to help lead the fight against Alzheimer's. She and her son, Tyler, have established the Pat Head Summitt Foundation to carry on this battle that is and will be so very, very important to millions of people.

Coach Summitt became head coach of the UT Lady Vols at the very young age of 22 because nobody was interested in the job. At that time, only the players and their parents attended the games. Thanks largely in part to Pat Head Summitt, women's basketball gained major support, drawing crowds of 20,000 and more.

She certainly was the most respected woman in Tennessee and my most famous constituent and longtime friend. I was honored on two occasions to be her honorary assistant coach. The first time was on her 25th anniversary as a coach, and the second time was several years later in a game against Vanderbilt on the last home game of the season. Before that game, we were given a scouting report. Tennessee had beaten Vanderbilt in Nashville by 30 points. So it is accurate to say that the team was fairly confident about this game.

□ 1045

However, at halftime, the game was almost tied, and the Lady Vols came into the locker room with their heads hanging down. That is when I saw Coach Summitt go into action. She got into each young woman's face like a baseball manager arguing with an umpire.

She started with Lady Vol Teresa Geter and told her in a drill sergeant's voice that she was going through a pity party out there, and Coach Summitt was having no part of it and was giving her 2 minutes to make her presence known on that court or she was going to yank her out of there so fast it would make her head spin.

When we went back out for the second half, the first thing that happened was that Teresa Geter stole the ball, and she took it down court for a lay-up and her first 2 points of the game. The Lady Vols went on a 20-0 run, and Vanderbilt called a timeout.

A spectator in the stands, whom I had not seen because there were 20,000 people there, sent his card down to me, and on the back he had written: "Jimmy, great halftime coaching, come again."

But it was not me; it was Coach Summitt. In fact, when she was staring each one of her players in the face at halftime in an intensely angry, very loud voice, I was just glad I was not one of those players.

Coach Summitt was the winningest coach in basketball history, with 1,098 victories. Her teams won 16 Southeastern Conference championships and eight national championships. She coached in 18 Final Fours. She had an 84 percent winning record as a head coach.

But to me, her most impressive statistic was a 100-percent graduation rate by her players. And she did not allow her players to take easy courses because she wanted them to be prepared for life after basketball, and almost all of her players have been successful after leaving the University of Tennessee.

On top of this, she never had a question raised about her recruiting or any NCAA violation. She showed through the years that you do not have to cheat in sports to win and be very successful.

She succeeded at her most important job, being a mother and raising her son, Tyler.

Coach Summitt was inducted into the Women's Basketball Hall of Fame and was NCAA Coach of the Year an unprecedented seven times. In 2000, she was named Naismith Coach of the Year.

Pat Head Summitt was a woman of great honor and integrity. She was a great, great success because of her very hard work, dedication, determination, and discipline. Most of her success she credited to her hardworking parents and lessons she learned on her family's Tennessee farm.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is a better place today because of Coach Pat Head Summitt and her work with young people and the inspiring example that she set for all of us.

FALLEN HEROES MEMORIAL

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Fallen Heroes Memorial in Nueces County, Texas.

After first being proposed in 2011, the Nueces County Fallen Heroes Memorial will be open in early August. This memorial honors local emergency responders who have sacrificed their lives

for our community going back to 1860. Instead of fading into history, these men and women will be remembered each time someone visits the memorial.

The project has been a community-driven effort since its inception. I would like to commend Nueces County Commissioner Mike Pusley, who has been the leader on this effort from the very beginning. It was Mike who noticed a defunct and over-budget water fountain in front of the County Courthouse and decided to take action. The Nueces County Fallen Heroes Memorial is possible because of Pusley's leadership, leadership everyone in the public sector should aspire to.

Pusley is an example for others in public service, men and women who go above and beyond their duties to imagine and create solutions to problems in the community.

While it was Pusley's vision that got the ball rolling on this, it was the financial support of the Durrill family and others in the community that helped make this a reality. Along with the Coastal Bend Community Foundation, the Durrills have provided a majority of the funding for the project. This family is a prime example of what community-driven efforts can accomplish.

I wish to express how deeply grateful we are to those first responders who have given their lives in service of their country and our community. Here are just a few of the first responders this memorial honors: Lieutenant Stuart J. Alexander. In 2009, Lieutenant Alexander was intentionally struck and killed by a suspect fleeing police.

Officer Matthew B. Thebeau. In 2008, Officer Thebeau was killed in an automobile accident while responding to an assault-in-progress call.

And Sergeant Juan Rincon Prieto, who, in 1963, was struck and killed by a truck while directing traffic.

The Nueces County Fallen Heroes Memorial remembers these and 28 other first responders who have fallen in service to Nueces County over the years, all leaving behind friends and loved ones, police officers, members of the Sheriff's Department, constables, firefighters, and other first responders. These are the men and women who put their lives on the line every day for our community. They keep the law. They keep the peace. And they keep us safe.

The memorial will be opened at a celebration attended by members of the community, including State Representatives Todd Hunter and Able Herrero, Nueces County Judge Loyd Neal, and Mayor Nelda Martinez. I look forward to attending as well.

I urge everyone to visit this memorial and remember those who have died in the line of duty.

CONGRATULATING JIM LAGO FOR HIS INDUCTION INTO THE TEXAS RADIO HALL OF FAME

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment today to congratulate my friend and mentor, Texas radio icon, Jim Lago, for his in-

duction into the Texas Radio Hall of Fame. Lago and I have been together on the radio now for more than 15 years.

Lago is a 30-year radio veteran, and he got his start when the crew he was working on in the oil field pressured him to take a part-time DJ job in Longview, Texas. Over just 4 years, through determination and talent, he moved his way up to doing mornings in Beaumont and afternoons at KILT in Houston.

He also spent some time in Oklahoma City, where he covered the Oklahoma City bombings after feeling the buildings rock from the nearby explosion. He was also live on the air in Corpus Christi when the 9/11 attacks occurred.

In 1991, he was working at KEYS in Corpus Christi, where he got his start in talk radio. In 2005, he and I moved to 1360 KKTU to host his popular morning talk show, "Lago in the Morning," where I am on almost every morning.

Lago's success comes from his never-giving-up attitude. Jim isn't afraid to discuss tough topics. He isn't afraid to speak his mind and take full ownership of his beliefs. In his words, Jim is on the air to let people know that there are people with similar beliefs out there, and they shouldn't be afraid to speak up. It is clear Lago is doing just that and doing what he was born to do.

I would like to congratulate my good friend, Jim; his wife, Pamela; and his family, on this well-deserved, in my opinion, long overdue induction into the Radio Hall of Fame in Texas.

PITTSBURGH'S 200TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the city of Pittsburgh which, this year, is celebrating the 200th anniversary of its incorporation as a city.

For two centuries, Pittsburgh has embodied the very best of the American spirit. Waves of immigrants, the tired, poor, and huddled masses from distant lands, as well as Americans from other parts of this country, found opportunity in Pittsburgh for themselves and their descendants, and the neighborhoods they settled still reflect that diversity.

Together, these individuals built a city out of coal, steel, and hard, honest work that epitomized the industrial character of our Nation. And while the vast furnaces that once lined the three rivers are a shadow of their past, the perseverance of Pittsburgh citizens have allowed the city to become a world leader in medicine, education, and technology, with world-class universities, hospitals, and research centers.

It is a success story no one could have predicted, and the story is far from over. The past 200 years have

firmly cemented Pittsburgh's place in the history books, leaving future generations of Pittsburghers with vital roles to play in the coming years.

Happy birthday to America's most livable city, the city of champions. Many happy returns.

CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PITTSBURGH'S LIBRARY FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the work of an institution that improves the lives of the blind, visually impaired, physically handicapped, or reading disabled by providing them free access to books in braille or audio format, mailed directly to recipients or instantly downloadable.

The National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, or NLS, was established by an act of Congress in 1931 and falls under the jurisdiction of the Library of Congress. It started out as a network of only 19 libraries in 1931, and it has grown to 56 regional and 65 subregional libraries throughout the United States. These libraries provide audio-described DVDs, books, and magazines as well as large-print and braille books.

I was honored to do an audio recording of myself reading a children's book via the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. The book I read was "Uncle Andy's Cats," by James Warhola, the nephew of Pittsburgh's native son, pop artist Andy Warhol. The audio book will be archived by the Library of Congress and available for children. I encourage others to do the same.

THE STANDARD OF LAW DOES NOT APPLY TO THE CLINTONS

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's top law enforcement officials took a very dangerous turn last week when they essentially rewrote the law for the well-connected and privileged in America. This should be deeply troubling to all ordinary Americans, both on the left and on the right.

For those of us who work hard every day, play by the rules, and live by the law, when we cross the line, it is the law that holds us accountable. But that standard of law does not seem to apply to the Clintons.

John Adams warned during the formation of our Constitution that we must be a nation of laws, not a nation of men. Undermining this founding principle for the privileged not only demonstrates poor judgment, it further erodes our trust in the institutions of government.

So it is left for us to now ask whether what we have come to is a nation of laws, or is it a government of the rich and powerful?

Do we have a Department of Justice or a department of "just us"?

FBI Director James Comey testified before Congress to the many laws that former Secretary of State Clinton

broke, acknowledging “extreme carelessness” while denying “gross negligence,” which by definition are one and the same.

Then, incredibly, Mr. Comey said that there was no need for prosecution. Therefore, the choice not to apply the law equally to Hillary Clinton is not only a major blow to public confidence and the rule of law and equal treatment under the law, it also suggests that the rule of law has become nothing more than a word game. It confirms everything that we hate about the current state of politics in our country.

The FBI basically just wasted millions of dollars to confirm that everything Secretary Clinton has been telling the American people is nothing but a bunch of lies, and it doesn't matter.

However, it has mattered greatly to far less powerful Americans in similar circumstances who have had their careers and their lives destroyed. Public servants and military servicemembers who are not in positions to hold private meetings with the Attorney General, as Mrs. Clinton's husband did just days before this decision, have been jailed, fined, and lost their jobs and their security clearances.

We may never know just how much damage was caused by Clinton's callous disregard for the law and our national security secrets. Were informants killed? Were they lost or compromised due to her negligence?

Do foreign intelligence services now retain tens of thousands of emails from her private, unsecured servers that can now be used against the United States or against her to the detriment of the United States of America?

We have an absolute duty to find out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward a presumptive nominee for the Office of President.

URGING CONGRESS TO FUND ZIKA ERADICATION EFFORTS

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a strong sense of urgency for this Congress to pass legislation that will fund Zika response efforts. It has been 20 days since this House adopted the conference report to include \$1.1 billion of funding to combat the Zika virus.

While I still fully support the administration's request for \$1.9 billion, this House-passed measure is a step in the right direction. I implore my colleagues in the Senate to unite and provide funding to eradicate a disease that could devastate our communities, especially young mothers and their infants.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent the southernmost district in the United States that spans from Miami

to Key West. We have a vibrant community and an economy based off trade and tourism. But we are also ground zero for the Zika virus, with over 239 cases in Florida, 75 of those being in Miami-Dade County. Just yesterday, the Florida Department of Health announced six new travel-related cases of Zika.

I have consistently advocated for full funding at the administration's request to stop the spread of Zika and will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get this done. But in the meantime, I strongly encourage the Senate to adopt the Zika conference report and provide our healthcare officials with the resources they need to fight this dangerous virus.

PROMOTING TPP AND PROTECTING AMERICAN JOBS

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the issue of trade has been much discussed in the current political season. Candidates all across the political spectrum are twisting the facts and telling half-truths in an effort to confuse the American people.

The reality is that trade has afforded American workers and businesses the opportunity to sell the products they make all over the world, and it has reduced the cost of goods for all American consumers. Trade has lifted millions out of poverty and has contributed to the proliferation of American values and the advancement of our interests. South Florida being the gateway to the Americas, our community knows the many benefits of robust trade policies.

However, free trade must also be fair trade, and American workers and companies should not be at an unfair disadvantage. Many citizens have contacted my office complaining about Chinese practices that do not allow Americans to compete. But even strong U.S. allies are guilty of such practices. An example is Australia's Personal Property Securities Act.

Because of this law, U.S. companies that lease assets in Australia are at peril of losing them. This notion is contrary to the elemental right to own and conduct international business as well as the fundamental right to due process and equal treatment, both of which are key principles of justice in virtually all nations in the Western world. At least one Florida company has been aggrieved by this law, and it is important we discuss these issues while we finalize trade negotiations.

Those of us who believe the Trans-Pacific Partnership has the potential to be a powerful policy instrument that will benefit America's economy and increase our influence in the world also hope that it will level the playing field for American workers and entrepreneurs and address the policies and practices that give trade a bad name. I look forward to following this issue very closely as negotiations continue.

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 11 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Malcolm J. Byrd, Jackson Memorial AME Zion Church, Hempstead, New York, offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou in whom we live and move and have our being, God of our weary years and God of our silent tears, Thou who hath spangled the heavens with Thy glory, descend now, we pray, upon the United States of America.

Grant unto our Nation the gifts of truth and justice. Imbue our Nation and its leaders with wisdom and courage to speak truth to power in love, even if that power happens to be themselves.

Grant unto them Thy grace that You extend to all, not based upon sociopolitical status, but upon Thy omnipresence. As You are present from sea to shining sea, be Thou our guide as we are caused to traverse through our respective districts, engendering hope in oft hopeless situations.

Our hope and trust, O God, is in Thee. We channel in the midst of our various strivings the words of Joseph Charles Price: It matters not how dark the night, we believe in the coming of morning. May our Nation be filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction this day and forever more. In Thy great and splendid name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LANGEVIN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND MALCOLM
J. BYRD

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Reverend Malcolm J. Byrd, the Pastor of Jackson Memorial AME Zion Church in Hempstead, New York, and to thank Reverend Byrd for leading us in prayer on the House floor today.

I first met Reverend Byrd 1 year ago yesterday, just a few weeks after nine Black men and women were murdered inside Mother Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina. Reverend Byrd held a service and presented a colorful patchwork quilt that the children of his church created to send to the Mother Emanuel congregation.

Leading us in prayer, Reverend Byrd said that day: "O, God, there is a long road that leads from Hempstead to Charleston, but there is one thing that makes us closer than the miles that separate us: We are all part of the family of God."

Today, as we find ourselves once again in the wake of tragic violence, we are blessed to have Reverend Byrd here with us. He is a man of God, a man of faith, a man of peace and hope. He is also a man of vision, a man who sees America as it is, as it can be, as it must and will be: a patchwork quilt in which people of all colors and creeds are sewn together as brothers and sisters, united in our common humanity.

There is a long road that leads from Hempstead to Orlando and to Baton Rouge and to Falcon Heights and to Dallas. There is a long road that leads from Hempstead to Washington, D.C., but I thank God that Reverend Byrd has traveled that road safely today. I pray that we all take his message to heart and never forget that, no matter what distance lies between us or what walls may divide us, we are all a part of the family of God.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

MY THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS ARE
WITH DALLAS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the city of Dallas and all who call north Texas home. Last week our community experienced a horrific tragedy when five police officers were murdered in cold blood, and they were gunned down while safeguarding a peaceful rally.

My thoughts and prayers continue to be with the families, friends, and fellow

law enforcement officers of the five brave men we lost. I also pray for peace, comfort, and for hearts to be healed.

The memorial service in Dallas yesterday reminds us of what many Texans already know: we are a family. While we may not always agree, all Americans should have mutual respect for one another, and we must have an ultimate, mutual respect for our constitutional rights, first and foremost being life and liberty.

God bless Dallas. God bless America.

GOOD GUYS WITH GUNS

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, ever since the Sandy Hook shooting, Republicans have told us that the silver bullet solution to a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun.

After the Pulse nightclub massacre, Donald Trump said it would have been a beautiful sight if people had fired back. Though Trump's endorsement of combining alcohol with firearms was too extreme even for the NRA, they still encourage people to carry guns to campuses, public parks, and everywhere else.

Let's talk about the good guys with guns. Twelve good guys, Dallas law enforcement officers, men and women, trained to shoot, were stopped by one bad guy. Five officers were killed and seven were wounded.

Whether it is a security guard or an entire police force, there is no stopping a single bad guy with a military-style assault rifle. If our best trained officers can be thwarted, how could the average shooter stop another shooter?

It is time for Congress to focus on the needs of our constituents over gun manufacturers' profits. Instead of flooding the streets with more guns, let's vote on commonsense gun laws.

HONORING TOM ALLGEIER'S SERVICE
TO THE KUHLL HOSE COMPANY

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of 60 years of dedicated service by Thomas "Tom" Allgeier to his community as a volunteer firefighter. Since 1956, Tom has volunteered to serve the citizens of Greene Township, Erie County, as a member of the Kuhl Hose Company. As a volunteer firefighter myself, I know how important people like Tom are to the communities they serve.

Tom Allgeier joined the Kuhl Hose Company at the age of 18, when the company was in its early days. He has held many positions during his 60 years with the company, including fire chief,

deputy chief, fire captain, first lieutenant, and EMT. He has also served in administrative roles for the department, from president to vice president and treasurer. He has chaired many fundraising committees and helped to raise hundreds of thousands of dollars for the department over the past six decades.

Tom remains among the leaders in training, hours logged each year, both in weekly drills and attending classes to keep his training current. At 78 years old, Tom is still running emergency calls.

I know I speak for countless members of his community in applauding Tom's hard work and his dedication.

GUN VIOLENCE SHOULDN'T BE A
PARTISAN ISSUE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, in the 1 month since 102 people were shot and 49 were killed in Orlando, Republican leadership in this House has done nothing to help stop the kind of mass gun violence that has claimed the lives of more than 34,000 people in the last 3½ years. No votes have been cast. No bills have been debated. No proposals have even been considered.

Our side wants background checks and no fly, no buy so criminals, the dangerously mentally ill, and terrorists can't get guns. If you don't like our ideas, join with us and let's find common ground.

Gun violence shouldn't be a partisan issue. When deranged gunmen open fire in a nightclub, a movie theater, a school, or on policemen, they don't care if you are a Democrat or a Republican. Let's pull together and address this problem. It is within our power to help save lives. Let's not waste it.

SPEAKER RYAN'S "A BETTER
WAY" AGENDA

(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. Madam Speaker, in recent weeks, Speaker of the House PAUL DAVIS RYAN has presented the A Better Way agenda on how to build a more confident America. I am grateful for the Speaker promoting A Better Way to defend America's families and create jobs.

Recent terrorist attacks at home and overseas confirm what House Republicans have warned about for years—that the current foreign policy is failing. To promote peace through strength to protect American families, we need a real plan, one that protects the homeland, defeats terrorism, tackles new threats, and defends freedom around the world.

As the chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging

Threats and Capabilities, I am grateful that A Better Way emphasizes the importance of combating new threats. Each element of A Better Way presents real solutions for the biggest problems facing our Nation.

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

Congratulations Prime Minister Theresa May for your success for the citizens of the United Kingdom.

ADDRESSING THE CALIFORNIA DROUGHT

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, today I rise to speak on the provisions included in the fiscal year 2017 Interior appropriations bill to address the California drought.

The language is well intentioned and seeks to alleviate some of the issues that we Californians are facing because of the drought. However, we have to take into account all impacts of increased pumping and how it affects our river ecosystems, our fishing economy, and our wildlife associated with the San Joaquin River.

I support increased pumping to aid those affected by the drought, especially in the Central Valley. If you had gone to see some of those homes, it is really damaging.

But we also have to take a look at the long-term impact. We need to look at developing our long-term water sustainability and our infrastructure, as we have done in Orange County, in my home district, where we were able to avoid some of the terrible effects of this drought because we invested, over the last 15 years, in water reclamation and water recapture. About 90 percent of the water that we use in my hometown is completely recycled.

As I have said before, we need to pass drought legislation, and we need to listen to all of the stakeholders.

75 YEARS IN THE TURKEY INDUSTRY

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the anniversary of an outstanding Minnesota company that has been providing quality food for the past 75 years.

Jennie-O Foods markets over 1,500 products to more than 70 countries around the world. Since its founding in 1940 by Earl B. Johnson, this company has been recognized as a leader in the turkey industry.

Jennie-O Foods had humble beginnings, which all began when Earl started raising turkeys while managing a small creamery. Nine years later, Earl

bought a turkey processing plant in Willmar, Minnesota, and the company flourished. Jennie-O Foods has had nothing but success over the years with the invention of products like the first turkey hot dog, eventually catching the eye of another great Minnesota company, Hormel Foods in 1986.

I want to not only congratulate Jennie-O for their 75 years of success, but I join the great State of Minnesota in thanking them for their contribution to our State and our Nation. We wish you nothing but continued success.

PERKINS REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, last week the Committee on Education and the Workforce unanimously reported H.R. 5587, the Strengthening CTE for the 21st Century Act, out of committee. This bipartisan bill reauthorizes the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, which expired in 2012.

I am so proud to be an original co-sponsor, and I would particularly like to thank Representative G. T. THOMPSON from the great State of Pennsylvania, my good friend and colleague and co-chair of the CTE Caucus, for his outstanding efforts to reauthorize these programs. The program is certainly far better off where it is because of his due diligence, the hard work that he put into the bill.

Thanks also to Chairman KLINE and Ranking Member SCOTT for their commitment to bipartisanship on this critical legislation. As I said, it passed out of committee unanimously. When does that ever happen around here these days?

H.R. 5587 is a bill that we can all be proud of. It aligns skills training with employer demands, allows teachers to gain direct knowledge of workplace skills, and ensures that all students have access to high-quality CTE.

Madam Speaker, I urge you to bring this bill to the floor at the earliest opportunity.

□ 1215

FACEBOOK SUPPRESSING CONSERVATIVE VIEWS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, recently, it was revealed that the tech giant Facebook may have altered its popular trending news section to suppress conservative views. Facebook's CEO promised to make changes.

Now it has been reported that Facebook removed a viral video that showed how media company NowThis was editing footage of Donald Trump

to make him seem insensitive and racist. And last week, a gun range owner in Houston, Texas, said his Facebook page had been blocked after he advertised free concealed handgun classes.

If these allegations are true, Facebook will not be a credible source of information for the American people. Let's hope that Facebook will demonstrate it has no bias against conservatives.

21ST CENTURY HEARTLAND TOUR

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I proudly come from a rural district in the State of Illinois. We have some of the best farmland anywhere in the world and what I would consider to be some of the hardest workers in America. But too often, communities like ours have been left behind or left out.

We have had manufacturing jobs that have been sent overseas. We have had access to health care that has been very challenging. Net farm income has dropped. Many of our rural communities are without high-speed Internet. That hurts our businesses and even affects our children doing their homework.

But even with these challenges, rural America holds tremendous potential. That is why I am kicking off what I am calling the 21st Century Heartland Tour. I am doing this to put Illinoisans in rural communities back to work, position ourselves to lead the Nation in clean energy, and to support our growers and producers who put food on the table of millions of Americans every single day.

Madam Speaker, let's work together to ensure a strong and thriving 21st century heartland.

ADDRESSING OPIOID PROBLEM WITHIN MEDICARE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, last week, the House passed a comprehensive opioid bill.

I am pleased my Medicare part D drug management program was included in this legislation to help address the growing opioid problem within Medicare.

This measure, which has the support of CMS and is recommended by the inspector general and GAO, would leverage a program successfully used in commercial insurance, Medicaid, and TRICARE.

The growth in commonly prescribed opioids in part D increased by 56 percent from 2006 to 2014. This part D drug management program will help address this growing opioid problem within the Medicare program while assuring those who need medications will have access to their prescriptions.

I am proud we could get this done for our seniors and all who are struggling across the country.

THANKING HEADCOUNT.ORG

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

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and thank HeadCount, a nonpartisan organization that uses the power of music to register voters and promote participation in democracy. They reach young people and music fans where they already are—online and at concerts across the country—from Dead & Company to the Dixie Chicks.

Their message is not about what political party you support or what issues you care about but, instead, that, as younger voters, you must be heard.

Let's face it. The single greatest determining factor to whether or not you vote is likely age. That means older people often get heard on issues that are important to them, which can be different than those of younger voters.

Whether you care about common-sense gun violence protections, global warming, or equality for everyone, HeadCount is a platform to help people get heard.

Thank you, HeadCount.org, for all you do in broadening our democracy.

RECOGNIZING STEVE AND DIANE SPURLING WITH CITIZEN HERO AWARD

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and award St. Charles School Board member Steve Spurling and his wife, Diane, with a Citizen Hero Award for acting quickly to protect the life of a woman in distress.

On May 3, the two were walking their dog when a woman ran out of her house bloodied, falling on the driveway, and calling for help. While the Spurling family rushed to aid their distressed neighbor, a man exited the house yelling for the woman before pulling out a gun and shooting five times at the group.

Reacting quickly and selflessly, Mr. Spurling tackled the shooter from behind, disarmed him, and held him down. The woman was rushed to Delnor Hospital in Geneva and has recovered from her injuries.

Steve serves our community by providing educational leadership, and both he and his wife acted courageously to save the life of their neighbor. The 14th District Citizen Hero Award recognizes exemplary constituents in my district who inspire others with their commendable actions.

Steve and Diane, it is my pleasure to represent you and extend our district's heartfelt gratitude with this award.

HONORING KEVIN HANRAHAN

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a friend and fellow Omahan, Kevin Hanrahan, the Tally Clerk of the House. He retires this September, after 38 years of distinguished service to the House of Representatives.

In 1978, Kevin left Omaha with former Congressman John Cavanaugh, with whom he remains friends to this day, and shortly thereafter joined the Clerk's Office, where he has worked in the Tally section for the past 37 years—29 as an Assistant Tally Clerk and the last 8 as a Tally Clerk.

Kevin is a workhorse, not a show horse. His depth of parliamentary and institutional knowledge is matched only by his love of this institution. He has played a pivotal role in making the process operate smoothly, and his knowledge and guidance will be deeply missed.

While Kevin's upcoming retirement is a big loss for his colleagues and the House, we wish him and his lovely wife, Peggi, nothing but the best in their next chapter of life. I am pretty sure most of that chapter will be written on the golf course. With that, I wish them long drives and birdie putts.

I might also add that Kevin and I played rugby at Creighton University a few years ago.

Thank you, Kevin, for your outstanding service and for being a remarkable example to your colleagues of what serving this institution is all about.

PRECISION FARMING

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Madam Speaker, despite the Internet being an integral part of modern American life, there are still many rural farmers across our Nation who do not have access to this essential tool.

The Internet has the power to revolutionize the agriculture sector, and North Country farmers have shared with me various ways that increased broadband access could provide them with opportunities for innovation and improved agribusiness. For instance, a dairy farmer from Potsdam who spoke with my office uses broadband to automate feeding plans for his cows.

To support our North Country farmers, I will be introducing the Precision Farming Act of 2016. This legislation will encourage the construction of rural broadband connections to farms by allowing providers to receive reimbursements for the costs related to construction. Furthermore, this legislation would put our Nation's farmers first by prioritizing their loan applications for additional construction.

To compete in a 21st century economy, our farmers must have access to broadband technology. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I want to bring to light the fact that we are still trying to get two bills passed in the House. How many more innocent lives will be lost before that happens?

My people, everybody's people, the American people want gun reform. My Republican colleagues are blocking the vote. But we need to have a voice. No more silence.

Stop blaming mental health issues for mass shootings. The fact is, more often they are the victims rather than the perpetrators. Anger, hate, and racism are the main causes of mass shootings.

Reducing the mental health stigma would save lives, as two-thirds of gun deaths are suicides. I encourage those who need help, to seek help, reduce self-harm, and learn the signs of mental illness. We need to focus on prevention and training, especially of police and the public, on mental health, not more guns. We need to educate youth on how to peacefully resolve problems by conflict resolution and anger management.

We must change the culture of violence. Violent images are too common in media, entertainment, and video games. Learn to have less hatred, more tolerance, and focus on what unites us.

Allow us a vote to prevent terrorists and others on the no-fly list from buying guns and universal background checks for guns.

PRESIDENT'S SUPREME COURT RECORD

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

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, since taking office in 2009, President Obama and his administration have taken a position in 175 cases before the Supreme Court, but the President has only won 79 of those cases. That comes out to just about 45 percent.

Indeed, over the course of his Presidency, the Obama administration argued 44 cases before the Supreme Court where their position failed to get a single vote. Not even the people the President appointed to the Court agree with his position.

This number stands in stark contrast to the results from President George W. Bush, who won over 60 percent of his cases before the Court, and Bill Clinton, who won 63 percent of his cases.

Most of the cases President Obama has lost have only one thing in common: the President's view that Federal

power is virtually unlimited. Under this President, citizens must submit their liberty and freedom to whatever the government experts determine is best. The administration believes they can operate above or around the law.

Madam Speaker, the President's record in front of the Court is a disturbing trend and something that should alarm every single American.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to talk about an issue that has affected my community in San Bernardino very personally and continues to impact our neighborhoods on almost a daily basis: gun violence.

Over the past several weeks, Americans have stood together to demand action on commonsense measures to reduce gun violence. My office has dealt with full voice mails, flooded social media sites, and received countless letters asking for these commonsense reforms.

The message is the same: Background checks are basic measures that will make our communities safer while respecting the Second Amendment rights of responsible gun owners. And if you are too dangerous to fly on a plane, you are too dangerous to buy a gun.

Madam Speaker, these measures are not controversial. Keeping guns out of the hands of suspected terrorists and criminals are basic measures where both Democrats and Republicans should be able to find common ground.

I ask that this Chamber remain in session until we vote on this legislation. By foregoing bipartisan legislation to end gun violence—bills our constituents are demanding us to consider—House Republicans are playing favor to special interests.

We owe the American people a vote. If we are too scared in this body to vote on these commonsense measures out of loyalty to our special interest groups instead of our own constituents, then we need to reflect on our roles here.

□ 1230

INCREASING TRANSPARENCY IN AMERICA'S HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, each year, families across the country face difficult decisions about where they can afford to send their children to college and what institution is the best fit for them.

Students must wade through massive and often conflicting amounts of information in order to make an informed choice. Taking time to fully under-

stand the available data can be an aggravating task that may get put off and ultimately ignored, often with disastrous consequences.

I want to thank my colleagues for their support this week of my legislation to help students gain access to the facts they need to make an informed decision about where to pursue higher education.

H.R. 3178, the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act, will begin to streamline the overwhelming maze of information currently provided to students and families at the Federal level.

It is crucial that we continue to increase transparency in the country's higher education system. This legislation is a positive step forward in that effort.

RESPONDING TO THE EPIDEMIC OF GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, last evening, we, the members of the Democratic Caucus, came together in an evening of remembrance to mark the 1-month anniversary and honor the lives of the 49 individuals who were massacred in Orlando at the Pulse Nightclub.

We are about now to leave Congress, adjourn for 7 weeks, failing in our sacred responsibility to keep the American people safe. During that time, during our recess, about 5,000 Americans will die at the hands of guns.

Too many communities have been stained by the blood of gun violence, and Congress has done nothing. We have begged and pleaded and implored and argued to bring to the floor responsible gun safety legislation, to do something to honor the lives that have been lost. Yet, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have refused—have refused to show the courage to stand up and do what is right for the American people. I pray that they find the courage to do that, and that we finally do something to reduce gun violence in this country and to honor the lives that have been lost, and to finally leave this Chamber knowing that we have responded and done something to respond to the epidemic of gun violence in America.

CONSCIENCE PROTECTION

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

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, this Nation was founded by those seeking to escape the coercive forces of governments across Europe.

This basic freedom is under assault today as radical advocates for abortion are using the coercive forces of Federal, State, and local governments to compel pro-life individuals, businesses, and healthcare providers, to act

against their deeply held religious convictions in order to keep a job or to hold a medical license or to operate a hospital, clinic or health insurance plan.

No one should be forced to violate their deeply held convictions against taking innocent lives. Yet, the Obama administration has simply refused to enforce the current conscience law, most recently in California.

With the passage of our bill, pro-life Americans will no longer be forced to appeal to this administration for relief. This bill will enable Americans to file suit in court and, once and for all, end this coercion. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this very important legislation so that the rights of pro-life Americans are restored.

CONGRESS HAS NO ZIKA PREVENTION PLAN

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, what will we tell American families when their child is born with microcephaly caused by the Zika virus?

It is not a hypothetical question. Families in Puerto Rico are already answering it. Over 276 travel-related cases of Zika have been reported in my home State of Florida, 43 cases affecting pregnant women.

In Florida, we are on the front line and we are at risk of local outbreaks. The Florida delegation on both sides of the aisle supports funding to prepare for and prevent local infections, but we still don't have a bill.

Over the 7-week recess, while Federal, State, and local officials try to prepare for Zika without the resources they need, we will need to prepare answers for these families.

Did we do all that we could to prevent an outbreak? Did we follow recommendations from scientists and infectious disease experts? Did we assure women that they don't need to be afraid to become pregnant in my State of Florida?

I wish we could say that the leadership of this Congress put the health and security of American families above partisan politics. I hope, and they better hope, that it is not too late.

WHY WE'RE HERE

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to try to do justice to a beautiful poem that won a national contest by Eliana Jaffee. And the contest is "Why I'm Glad America is a Nation of Immigrants." And Eliana Jaffee's poem is "Why We're Here."

"That morning when the sun had risen, my shores, my seas, my hopes

freed from prison, the poor, the rich, and all the forgiven came to me.

“Go, ask that girl to compare, a life of despair to a breath of free air, ask her: Why are you here, not somewhere over there?”

“She’d say to you, that long ago, her ancestors came here, through hail, sleet and snow. Sunrise and sunset, they stayed there until the end, and when my job was finished, their hearts all had mends.

“I have been many things, and most are quite clear, a haven, a refuge that people hold dear.

“These waters of mine, so brilliant, so light, with hopes of tomorrow, a future, so bright. Coming from places of sadness and fear, I open my arms, and welcome them here.”

By Eliana Jaffee, a fifth grader at the Pardes Jewish School in Scottsdale, Arizona.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF CLEONE CREQUE

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cleone Creque. “Cle,” as many of us call her, was the first female in the Virgin Islands to be elected to territorywide office after she was elected Senator-at-Large in the Virgin Islands Legislature in 1976. This past weekend, the legislative annex conference room in St. John was named in her honor.

During her legislative career, she held key leadership positions on important Committees on Welfare, Health, and Labor. Aside from her distinguished legacy as a political stalwart and advocate for less fortunate in her community, she is a nurse, a mother, and a businesswoman, and she speaks her mind.

She is a positive and inspirational role model for Caribbean women, for all women, and she is my friend and my mentor.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO GLORIA JOSEPH

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, I would like to, at this time, extend happy birthday wishes to Gloria Joseph, a community organizer, public servant, matriarch, and Ph.D of haute cuisine.

I wish her happy birthday.

Both of these women are ultimate public servants, true Renaissance women, and true Virgin Islanders.

DEMOCRACY MATTERS

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Speaker, I would like to express my concern about events that are happening now in Brazil. In Brazil, President Dilma Rousseff was reelected because a majority of Brazilians wanted to pursue

her progressive policies further. But shortly after her reelection, some members of the rightwing opposition started to question the election results and, aided by the conservative media in Brazil, they accused her of manipulating the state budget in order to pay for social programs.

But now they have taken it further than that, and beyond mere accusations, and they have forced her temporarily out of office by impeaching her and putting her out of power while those proceedings take place.

The interim government is implementing the exact policies that were rejected by a majority of Brazilian voters, austerity, cutting social programs, cutting education, cutting housing, cutting health care. These are the things that people wanted; it is what they voted for. Yet, the interim government is undermining democracy by denying these things to the people who voted for them.

My message is simple. Democracy matters. Votes matter. All around the world we are seeing rightwingers trying to deny the democratic forces their rightful power for winning elections.

In Britain, we have seen an effort to undermine the results of Brexit. In Portugal, the same thing happened when a leftwing majority won parliament. And here in the United States, we have efforts to undermine the President. This must end. Democracy matters.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 13, 2016.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 13, 2016 at 9:13 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4875.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 764, NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 304, MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY WHISTLEBLOWER ACT; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 822 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 822

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 764) to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House 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 Agriculture or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House 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 Agriculture. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-61 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of July 14, 2016, or July 15, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Madam 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 822 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act, and a motion to concur with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 764, GMO labeling requirements.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today provides for consideration of S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act.

This bill protects rights of conscience for healthcare providers who choose not to participate in abortion.

The bill reinforces current law and makes clear that Federal, State, and local governments, including subsidiary agencies, cannot discriminate against healthcare providers who choose not to provide abortions.

This bill is necessary because the California Department of Managed Health Care has mandated that all health plans must cover elective abortion. This includes health plans offered by religious nonprofits, and even churches.

This action by the State agency violates a provision of Federal law known as the Weldon Amendment, which provides that States receiving Federal funds may not discriminate against health plans based on their decision not to cover or pay for abortions.

Religious employers in California who offer group health plans to their employees lodged an objection with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which oversees enforcement of the Weldon Amendment. HHS massively and incorrectly reinterpreted the Weldon Amendment to allow California to continue to force these employers to pay for and provide coverage for elective abortions.

In addition to providing commonsense protections, S. 304 also allows a private right of action, giving providers recourse should they face penalties or punishment for exercising their conscience rights.

To be clear, this bill does not ban or restrict abortion in any way. If enacted, abortion will remain just as legal as it is today. In spite of this fact, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will continue to protest this sensible legislation.

The Conscience Protection Act is not the only important legislation the House will consider this week. This rule also provides for consideration of a motion to concur with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 764, GMO labeling requirements.

The Senate amendment establishes a national labeling standard for bioengineered food, with exceptions for foods and products primarily composed of meat, poultry, or eggs.

This measure represents a truly bipartisan effort to prevent a complicated patchwork of State laws and regulations for labeling food products sold throughout the country that inevitably would lead to increased prices, confusion, and more than a few frustrated customers.

□ 1245

Americans would be well served to have both S. 304 and S. 764 considered this week, and I commend both bills to my colleagues as deserving of their support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from

North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this closed rule, which provides for consideration of S. 764, legislation to create, in my view, inadequate GMO labeling requirements, and S. 304, yet another Republican attack on women's health.

Both pieces of legislation are being rushed to the floor this week by the Republican leadership as they ignore urgent calls from the American people for action on a number of pressing public health crises like gun violence and the Zika virus.

Speaker RYAN promised a new way of doing business in this House when he became Speaker, but we continue to see more of the same broken promises and failed leadership. During the past several weeks, I have joined my Democratic colleagues in calling upon Speaker RYAN to hold a vote on two commonsense, bipartisan pieces of legislation that are overwhelmingly supported by the American people: the no fly, no buy bill, and legislation to expand and strengthen our background check system.

Communities in my home State of Massachusetts and across our country are raising their voices and coming together to demand that Congress do something, not hold more moments of silence but actually take action. At the very least, we can keep guns out of the hands of criminals and suspected terrorists. We have that power to do something about that, and, yet, the Republican majority continues to sit on their hands and be indifferent in the face of the tragedies that we read about each and every day in this country.

Recognizing this call for action, Speaker RYAN announced on June 30 that the House would vote during the coming week on Republican gun-related legislation. But instead of working with both Democrats and Republicans on a bipartisan bill, Speaker RYAN hastily pushed out a toothless, NRA-written and -backed bill that would do nothing to keep Americans safe.

But even more frustrating, but sadly not surprising, is the fact that even this bill was too much for some of the hardliners on the Republican side. So, instead of answering the call of the American people, eager for Congress to finally act to disarm hate and help prevent gun violence, Speaker RYAN has canceled any votes on gun safety legislation. It is really a sad situation, Madam Speaker.

One month after 49 lives were lost in Orlando to an act of hate and senseless gun violence, Speaker RYAN is ready to adjourn the Congress for the rest of the summer, failing to take any action at all to protect the American people and

keep guns out of the hands of criminals and suspected terrorists. Americans deserve better from their leaders, and I predict that the American people will not forget this.

But, look, we shouldn't be surprised. This is just the latest in a string of broken promises and failed action from this Republican majority and its leadership.

This week, instead of addressing the pressing issues I previously mentioned, the House will be voting on a weak—on a very, very weak—GMO labeling bill and yet another piece of legislation that attacks a woman's right to choose.

Every American has a fundamental right to know what is in the food that they eat, plain and simple. I believe they ought to have that right, and that is what today's debate is about. To be clear, today's debate is not about the science behind GMOs. It is also not about whether GMOs are good or bad. Whether you love GMOs or hate them, we should all agree that you ought to know if they are in the food that you are feeding to your family and your children.

Madam Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration requires labeling of thousands of ingredients, additives, and processes, many of which have nothing to do with safety or nutrition. For example, the FDA requires mandatory labeling of juice when it is from concentrate. It is just one of the ways we tell people what is in their food and how it is made.

This piece of legislation would require companies to label their products if they contain GMOs, and I strongly support that sentiment. But the way this legislation is written, it provides three options for labeling: words on the package, which makes sense; a symbol to be developed by USDA, which makes sense; but then there is this, a so-called quick response, or QR, code. It was at the behest of big industry that the QR code be listed as an option, not what is in the interest of the American consumer but what is in the interest of a few special interests.

Now, I would be much more comfortable with a bill that requires either words or a symbol, but a QR code is something that I cannot support. Nobody here should support that. In order to access the information through the QR code, an individual must have a smartphone and must have access to the Internet. The reality is that not every American has access to a smartphone or the Internet. Look, I don't get reception at a local grocery store here in D.C. just a couple of blocks from where we are here in the U.S. Capitol. It is frustrating. What good would a QR code do if I can't get a data signal using my phone? One in five Americans in the United States does not have a smartphone. That includes 50 percent of Americans who are low-income and living in rural areas and over 65 percent of elderly Americans. If we end up going down the route

of a QR code, all of these people will be prevented from accessing the information that this bill is supposed to make available to all consumers. Even if someone has a smartphone, they will have to scan every single item they purchase in order to obtain the desired information, and this is assuming they will have access to the Internet in the grocery store. That is anything but a quick response. It is a bad idea. It is a bad idea. It is an intentional measure to deny consumers information.

We considered what we call the DARK Act on this House floor a few months ago. This is the son of the DARK Act. It keeps people in the dark about what is in their food that they are buying. The debate about GMO labeling is about transparency and the right of every American to know what is in the food they eat. It is very simple. The best approach would be a clear and easy-to-understand label or symbol, not some crazy QR code that only creates more hassle and confusion.

From the very beginning of the debate about GMO labeling, some in the food industry have stuck to two main arguments. They have said that GMOs are perfectly safe and that it would cost far too much for them to add a symbol or words to their packaging. But once they came up with the idea to put a large QR code on their packaging that they hope consumers will just simply ignore or not be able to access, they suddenly dropped their complaints about the financial cost of changing their packaging.

The truth is that the QR code will take up more space on their packaging than any symbol or simple written label would, and the QR code is going to have to include wording as well. It would be so much easier and better for consumers for the food industry to just use wording or a symbol and not this complicated, confusing QR code.

We know that food companies change labels on their products all the time. Jerry Greenfield of Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream said that it is a normal cost of business to change their packaging. Campbell Soup is committed to including words on their packaging and has said that in doing this, there will not be an increase in food prices. I want to thank Campbell's as well as Mars and Dannon for all committing to using words on their label and not some kind of confusing QR code.

The majority of Americans favor mandatory GMO labels that are clear, straightforward, and easy to understand.

Wouldn't it be nice if—and I know this is a radical idea in this Congress—but wouldn't it be nice if, for once, this Congress actually did what the American people want? Keeping our constituents in the dark should not be tolerated. And, therefore, this bill should be soundly defeated by Democrats and Republicans alike.

Madam Speaker, we are also considering a totally unrelated bill, H.R. 4828, the so-called Conscience Protection

Act, which ironically is yet another unconscionable attempt to take away women's right to health care.

Under current law, hospitals and other healthcare providers can already refuse service to an individual based on the practitioner's own moral objection. But this legislation would take this a step further and actually permit the withholding of medical information about a patient's condition if the physician believes that such information could potentially lead to an abortion. Bosses would be permitted to impose their own religious beliefs across their entire company by withholding abortion services on employer-sponsored health plans. It is not an employer's decision what type of medical care is needed by their employees. Women have the same rights to access health care as men do, and no boss should be able to deny them that right.

This will be the House Republicans' 13th vote to attack women's health care in this Congress alone. Thirteen times we have gone down a similar road. How can we possibly consider a bill that would allow insurance companies, doctors, or healthcare facilities to substitute their own religious opinions for actual medical information? Every woman should be able to trust that, when they go to their doctor, they are receiving all the facts and information that they need to make their own health decisions.

Encouraging doctors to withhold vital information from women about their health is outrageous and incredibly dangerous. Such a reckless bill has no place in Congress. This bill is nothing more than the latest attempt by House Republicans to appeal to their extreme rightwing base.

This legislation does not include any exemption in the case of rape, incest, or endangering the life of the woman and would preempt any State law that does allow for the coverage of abortion.

Madam Speaker, we have countless women sharing their stories of how these types of laws have had devastating and tragic effects on them. One woman's water broke at 20 weeks prematurely, and doctors determined that the fetus would not survive birth. The Catholic hospital she was at refused to perform an abortion since the fetus still had a heartbeat. For 7 weeks, this woman had to carry a fetus in her with the knowledge that it had no chance of survival. It wasn't until she was suffering from severe hemorrhaging that a hospital would finally induce labor. The baby died almost immediately after birth, as doctors expected.

Another woman's water broke prematurely at 18 weeks. She was rushed to the nearest hospital, which was a Catholic hospital. Doctors knew that the fetus was no longer viable and would die immediately upon birth. However, this information was withheld from the woman. She was simply given two Tylenol and sent home unaware that there was no chance her

child would survive birth. The woman returned twice more, each time with severe bleeding, and it was only at the end of the second visit as they were sending her home, she went into labor and gave birth. The baby died within hours, as the doctors expected.

Women's health must always come first, and this only puts more lives at risk.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle not to support this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Conscience Protection Act, a bill I cosponsored to protect pro-life healthcare providers from discrimination.

Doctors, nurses, employers, social service agencies, and insurance plans that choose not to take part in abortions as a matter of conscience should not face discrimination or penalty.

This bill reaffirms protections already in place by prohibiting the Federal Government and entities that receive Federal funding from discriminating against or penalizing those who are exercising their conscience rights while, most importantly, it gives victims of discrimination legal recourse to defend themselves.

Currently, it is up to the Department of Health and Human Services to enforce the law—and that is something that this administration has not always been willing to do.

The Conscience Protection Act will give pro-life healthcare providers and employers full conscience protections without loopholes or uncertainty.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this essential bill to protect life and those who exercise their conscience rights.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

I oppose this closed rule on an obnoxious bill. This bill is just another attempt in a long line of Republican attempts to interfere with women's health choices. This bill is part of a disturbing national trend. Some legislators at the Federal, State, and local level are attempting to insert religious exemptions into antidiscrimination and pro-women's health laws with which they do not agree.

Rather than trying a frontal assault on the laws themselves—which they know they would lose—they seek instead to use the premise of religion to allow further discrimination against women. We must not let them succeed.

Let's be clear what this is really all about. The Republicans are not happy with the Supreme Court's pro-choice decisions. They are not happy with the Affordable Care Act, which provides contraceptive coverage to millions of women with no out-of-pocket costs.

□ 1300

But try as they may, they cannot overturn *Roe v. Wade* and they cannot repeal *ObamaCare*. The American people won't let them do that. So now they are trying to bring religion into the discussion and dare us to oppose what they call basic First Amendment principles about freedom of religion. Well, guess what: that is not going to work either.

We see their bias, we see their intent, and we will not let them enshrine discrimination into Federal law. We won't let you punish women just because you are not pro-choice. That is not going to happen.

Let's be honest. This is not about religion; it is about abortion and contraception. So let's stop the charade.

In this case, the bill's sole purpose is to deny access to, and create more barriers to women seeking medical procedures that are legal and constitutionally protected. The bill would enable employers and healthcare companies to override women's personal reproductive health decisions. We have said this before and we will say it again: women's reproductive healthcare decisions simply should not be their boss' business.

Religious convictions should be protected but cannot be permitted to infringe on the rights of others. Employers, other than religious institutions, have no right to impose their religious opinions on their employees. An employer's opinion about the propriety of birth control or abortion must have no bearing on whether an employee can get access to abortion or birth control services.

Certainly no woman should be denied information about her medical condition or about birth control or abortion because of the religious opinions of her employer; that is not protecting the religious opinion of the employer. That is projecting the religious opinion of the employer onto the employee in derogation of her rights. Religious protections must not be used as a sword against the rights of third parties. They must be used as a shield to protect your own religious liberty, but not to hurt other people.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, predictably, our colleagues are misrepresenting the contents of this bill. This bill does not affect any abortion provider who currently performs the procedure and who wishes to continue.

If the Conscience Protection Act becomes law, abortion will still be just as legal and accessible as it is today. The bill seeks only to ensure that healthcare providers will not be forced by government to violate their moral or religious convictions.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I am honored to stand before the House today to speak on the Conscience Pro-

tection Act. I am speaking today on behalf of the over 55 million children who are unable to speak for themselves. I grieve their deaths.

Abortion not only brutally ends the life of children, it also forever changes the lives of their mothers. Because of the negative outcomes of abortion for mothers and children, many healthcare providers choose not to participate in this abhorrent practice. We must protect healthcare providers who reasonably—and conscientiously—object to participating in abortion.

At a speech in 2009, President Obama said clearly: "Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion." But that is no longer the practice of this administration.

Today, across the country, in flagrant violation of Federal law, churches are being forced to buy healthcare plans that pay for abortions, and nurses have been forced to assist in abortions.

The Conscience Protection Act would stop the government from discriminating against providers that exercise their right of conscience. It would ensure that those who have been penalized for exercising this right are allowed their day in court.

Madam Speaker, nobody should be forced to choose between their values or their job. Our country was founded on the right of conscience. We cannot abandon them now.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let's be clear, and I want all of my colleagues to be clear on this issue. This bill would allow a woman's boss to decide whether or not she could have an abortion—her boss—because this bill allows employers who offer healthcare plans to deny women access to abortion services. This is outrageous, and I can't believe that this kind of bill has come to this floor.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote against the Conscience Protection Act. This is just another attempt by the Republican majority to create barriers for women as they make personal decisions about their reproductive health care. This legislation would expand and make permanent existing refusal policies, which would erode important patient protections.

If this law were enacted, employers and companies could refuse to provide information to women about their health care. That is unacceptable.

Women have a right to receive all of the information they need as they make important decisions that are personal to them. Women's access to care, our ability to make choices about our health, and our right to be informed should always be protected.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this damaging legislation for women's health.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, if laws already enacted in the religious liberty protections enshrined in our Constitution were actually being protected, we wouldn't be here. We wouldn't be needing to vote on the Conscience Protection Act in the House of Representatives today.

Is it an attempt to prevent something? Yes. It is an attempt to protect all Americans' rights under our First Amendment. It is just that simple. Unfortunately, the right to exercise one's own conscience is under attack in the United States at the Federal and State level.

Let's be very clear on this. Conscience, as defined, is the "inner sense of what is right or wrong in one's conduct or motives, impelling one towards right action." It is the feeling that one has done something morally right or wrong. You cannot deny people rights that were enshrined in our Constitution and in our Bill of Rights just because it doesn't happen to fit a popular narrative right now.

If we cannot come together as the people's House and protect what we have been given by our forefathers and has been enshrined in our Bill of Rights and try to make it into something different, then we have totally missed the mark, and America should be greatly disappointed in whom they have sent to represent them.

None of us can turn our back on the Constitution. None of us can say that somehow this is something different than what it is. It is the protection of one's freedoms and liberties under our Bill of Rights and in our First Amendment. It is that simple.

Conscience—conscience—why should somebody have to sacrifice their religious conscience because somebody says let's redefine it into something else? It is nothing more than doing the right thing because it is the right thing to do, and I am talking about religious conscience.

Why would we limit our schools and our hospitals of religious founding? Why would we say to them, no, you don't have the right to do this; we are going to supersede that?

It is protection for the rights of the First Amendment. That is something we all took an oath to do, and that is what we need to do.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, again, if you believe that a woman's boss should make the decision about whether or not she could have access to abortion services, then you support this bill. I happen to think that a woman should make that decision on her own. It should be her decision and not the decision of her boss.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts. I think he just put it correctly.

These are difficult choices. They are moral choices. They are choices from

the heart and choices from the gut. But I do think that a woman who is in need of an abortion in her mind has the right to have those kinds of services and has the right to not have her boss veto them for her.

The Conscience Protection Act is the latest in a long line of attempts to interfere with women's autonomy and medical care. I have come to the floor a number of times to defend a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions, a concept that, frankly, shouldn't need a defense at all. I respect decisions, one way or another.

This bill is marketed as one that would protect conscience rights, but let's be clear. Current law already allows health professionals to object to providing abortions for moral or religious reasons. The Conscience Protection Act would take this concept to a new extreme, expanding opportunities for employers to discriminate against women based on their reproductive health choices.

We have said this before and we will say it again: women's personal healthcare decisions are not their boss' business. An employer should not have the right to veto a medical decision by a woman. It is just not right.

Every patient should be able to make fully informed decisions about her health care without interference of her employer, and certainly without interference from Congress. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Again, whatever your moral choices are, I respect them; on both sides, I respect them. But it is not right for a woman who is seeking an abortion to have that abortion vetoed because her boss doesn't like abortions. I think that is a decision that should be left to the woman alone, not put more pressure on her, not force her to go against her will. This is something dealing with her body, her rights, not her boss' rights, so I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, the charge that this would allow a woman's boss to prevent her from obtaining an abortion is a true outrage. It is a disgusting red herring.

This bill would allow employers to continue to have the freedom to decline to pay for abortions. No American should be forced to pay for the killing of an unborn child, whether they are a taxpayer or a private citizen. The other side should not stoop to such tactics.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend, Mrs. Foxx for yielding and thank her for her extraordinary Pro-life leadership.

Madam Speaker, in an unconscionable abuse of power, for almost 2 years, the State of California has forced all insurance plans under its purview and the people in institutions that pay the premiums—to subsidize abortion on demand. Numerous faith-based entities

filed complaints pursuant to law with the HHS Office for Civil Rights seeking, and fully expecting, relief.

Effective June 21, however, the Obama administration flatly refused to enforce U.S. law—current law—protecting the civil right of conscience. Cardinal Timothy Dolan said, "It is shocking that HHS has allowed the State of California to force all employers—even churches—to fund and facilitate elective abortions in their health insurance plans."

I would note parenthetically to my colleagues, this isn't about ObamaCare and the massive taxpayer funding for abortion embedded—according to GAO's analysis—in over 1,000 insurance plans on the exchanges, which was contrary to what the President had promised right here in this Chamber, 30 feet away from me, in a joint session of Congress in 2009. No. This is about private health insurance plans of Catholic dioceses, religious schools, and others who have been ordered to violate their deeply held convictions and pay for the killing of unborn children by hideous dismemberment procedures, toxic compounds, or chemical poisoning.

The Weldon Federal conscience clause, authored by Congressman Dave Weldon of Florida and continuously in effect for well over a decade, is explicit and comprehensive, but it is not being enforced by the Obama Administration.

The Weldon amendment says, in pertinent part, that it is illegal for any "discrimination" against a healthcare entity "on the basis that the healthcare entity does not provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortions." The law's definition of healthcare entity explicitly includes "a health insurance plan."

Despite the absolute clarity of the Weldon language, injured parties, including the Catholic church, have been denied relief.

The Obama Administration's refusal to enforce the civil right of conscience is not only unfair and unjustified, it violates the rule of law, makes a mockery of the President's 2009 Notre Dame speech, mentioned by my colleague from Missouri, when Obama said: "Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion." Mr. Obama's words don't match his deeds and he is not honoring the civil rights of conscience.

The Conscience Protection Act of 2016, authored by Congresswoman DIANE BLACK, seeks to end discrimination against people, plans, and providers for refusing to be involved in the killing of unborn children. The bill says that the Federal Government or any State or local government that receives Federal assistance may not penalize, retaliate against, or otherwise discriminate against those who refuse to perform, refer for, pay for, or otherwise participate in abortion.

□ 1315

The linchpin of this legislation, of the Conscience Protection Act, pro-

TECTS people, insurance plans, and other entities from being forced to participate by providing a private right of action.

The HHS Office for Civil Rights has failed miserably. In this country, we need a remedy that is durable and that will provide the protection that people are demanding, especially today in California, but really the entire country.

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

Let's be honest with one another. What this is all about here is that some of my friends on the other side believe that abortion should be illegal all across the country, that no woman should have the right to abortion services. They are upset with the Supreme Court decision of *Roe v. Wade*, and they are frustrated that they can't find a way around it. This is what this is about: trying to deny women access to these kinds of services through maneuvers that are in this bill.

It is absolutely true that what this legislation does is to leave in the hands of her boss the decision about whether or not a woman can have an abortion or not. That is what this does. I want to be clear about one thing so my colleagues understand this. No taxpayer money—that is the law—can be used to subsidize abortion. That is the law of the land: no taxpayer money.

What this does is allow an employer who doesn't agree that abortion should be legal the ability to provide health insurance that doesn't cover it. So, if you are a low-income woman, you are out of luck. You could try to pay for the services out-of-pocket that are affiliated with having an abortion, which is almost impossible, and there could be complications.

It is crazy that we are here, debating a bill like this that would basically remove a woman out of this equation. We have better things to do on this House floor than this bill.

Let's also be clear in that the reason we are doing it now is that the Republican National Convention is next week, and my colleagues are desperate to appeal to the hard-liners in their base. That is what this is all about. This will never become law, and we shouldn't be doing this on the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, it is not true. Conservatives don't ask for bosses to purchase weapons that are protected under the Second Amendment. Why must my Progressive colleagues ask private citizens to pay for the death of a child?

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), the sponsor of the underlying legislation.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule to allow for the consideration of my bill, S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act.

The Members of this body represent a broad array of views on matters of life

and abortion. But, surely, we can all at least agree on this: that nobody should ever be forced to participate in the act of abortion against one's will. That is what my legislation is about.

As it stands today, the conscience rights of pro-life Americans are not being consistently upheld. As a matter of fact, nurses have been required to assist in abortions despite their moral objections, and States like California and New York are now requiring every insurance plan, including those by churches and Christian universities, to include elective abortion coverage. This is wrong.

Madam Speaker, I am a nurse. I have been so for more than 45 years, and I still keep my license today. I love my job, but I would never sacrifice my view on the sanctity of life in order to keep it, and I shouldn't have to. Being an American has always meant experiencing the freedom to live according to one's deeply held beliefs at home, at work, and in the public square. My bill simply ensures that that will remain the case.

Think about it this way: a search of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD returns over 1,300 results for the phrase "right to choose." My colleagues across the aisle use that term often. Of course, their argument leaves no choice for the unborn child in the womb, but it stands to reason that if politicians will protect that right to choose, then they must protect the other right to choose as well, the right not to be a forced partner in the practice of abortion. That is simply what my bill would do.

The government recognizes the importance of protecting conscience rights in other arenas: ObamaCare prohibits government discrimination against entities that do not participate in assisted suicide, and Federal employees are not required to participate in Federal death penalty executions. Why should abortion be any different?

Madam Speaker, if Americans can't abide by their own consciences, particularly on a matter of a deeply held belief such as this, then we have lost one of our most basic freedoms there is.

Just to reiterate that which has already been said, this bill does not change the law of today on abortion. It does not. I challenge my colleagues to show me in the language of the bill where it does. It will remain exactly the way it is. This bill does not affect women's access to abortion. As a matter of fact, even in the bill, we make sure that that access is still there in the bill's language, and this bill does not affect employers in the services that they give to their employees.

Today, we can change this. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule.

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

It is frustrating to listen to this debate because, apparently, facts don't matter. The fact of the matter is that this bill is not needed to protect

healthcare providers from being forced to provide or to participate in the provisions of abortion. Healthcare providers already have those protections under current law. What this bill does is to seek to empower a woman's boss to decide whether or not she can have access to abortion services—a woman's boss.

By the way, the health insurance that is being provided is not taxpayer-funded health care; it is health insurance that the woman herself pays into. She pays into health insurance, but her boss decides—if circumstances arose in which she thought, in order to protect her life or in extenuating circumstances, that she wanted to have an abortion—whether or not she could have that, whether or not it would be covered. That is what this is. This is about trying to deny women—in this case, mostly low-income women—the ability to have access to abortion services.

It is really kind of an underhanded attempt by my colleagues to get at Roe v. Wade, which I know they don't like. But that is the law of the land. They are trying to make it so that women cannot have access to safe abortion services if circumstances so call for that.

I just find this whole debate to be so out of touch with what the facts are. Again, existing policies already permit certain entities, like hospitals, to refuse to perform abortions, and most of these policies explicitly permit the refusal on the basis of religious or moral objection. What this does is to go a step further. It seeks to make it almost impossible for poor women in particular to be able to have access to the rights that they are guaranteed under the Constitution. I really think that this is a bad thing for us to be considering on the floor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, my colleague is correct. This debate is far from the facts, but it is not on our side of the aisle. When you say something wrong, repeating it doesn't make it correct. This bill has nothing to do with abortion access. That is a fact. It has to do with conscience rights, period.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, as a physician, I took an oath to save lives, to protect lives, and as a heart surgeon, I worked day and night to save lives, to protect life at every step of the way. I believe that the oath I took way back when I finished medical school meant protecting all stages of life.

Healthcare providers who share this belief should not be forced to act against their consciences by participating in or by facilitating an abortion. Current law prevents discrimination against healthcare providers who do not wish to participate in abortions. Unfortunately, the Department of Health and Human Services' Office for

Civil Rights refuses to enforce this policy in its taking years, oftentimes, to consider complaints of conscience rights violations. That is just wrong. It is wrong.

The Conscience Protection Act will provide the healthcare community—doctors, nurses, hospitals, and insurers alike—with the right to seek their day in court when the administration fails to enforce existing law. Americans should never be forced to violate their conscience rights in order to do their jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Today, we are dealing with two pieces of legislation on this rule: one that would deny women's rights and another that would deny consumers' rights in terms of this inadequate GMO labeling bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Consumers Union, which is opposed to the GMO labeling bill. I include in the RECORD a letter that opposes this legislation and that is signed by countless consumer and healthcare organizations. I also include in the RECORD a New York Times editorial entitled "A Flawed Approach to Labeling Genetically Modified Food."

CONSUMERS UNION, POLICY & ACTION
FROM CONSUMER REPORTS,

Yonkers, NY, July 12, 2016.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SLAUGHTER: Consumers Union, the policy and mobilization arm of Consumer Reports, urges you to vote no on S. 764, which includes a bill by Senator Roberts and Senator Stabenow related to the disclosure of genetically engineered (GE) food. This bill will not provide consumers with the clear information about GE food that nine out of ten consumers have repeatedly said they want. The legislation would preempt state laws requiring clear, on-package labeling of GE food, replacing them two or more years from now with an ineffective federal disclosure program to be established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Significant questions have been raised about this program's scope.

We have several specific concerns with S. 764. First, this bill, which allows USDA to take two years to develop implementing rules, undermines GE labeling occurring in the marketplace. Labels indicating that a food is produced with genetic engineering are already appearing on store shelves across the country, in compliance with duly enacted state labeling requirements. S. 764 would invalidate laws in states including Vermont, Alaska, Connecticut, and Maine, and produce a legal vacuum for at least two years while USDA writes federal rules.

Second, the definition of "bioengineering" is unclear, and will be subject to interpretation by the Secretary of Agriculture. As a result, there is an active and unresolved dispute about to what extent S. 764 includes or excludes many GE food products from the bill's requirements. This lack of clarity deeply concerns Consumers Union, as we believe that the regulations, should this bill become law, should be very broad in scope.

There are other significant problems with the bill's coverage. For example, while the bill does cover some products containing both GE ingredients and meat, it specifically

exempts any food where meat is the main ingredient, even if the food product contains other ingredients that are genetically engineered.

Third, S. 764 allows companies to employ methods of disclosure that are difficult to use, are not available to all consumers, and put rural, older and low income consumers at a disadvantage. The bill allows for disclosure via QR codes, designed to be scanned by a smartphone. Scanning a QR code may not be feasible for numerous consumers who are unfamiliar with the technology or who lack a smartphone, as three out of four older Americans and about half of rural residents do. As QR codes are already used for many purposes on packages, their presence is not a flag—it does not constitute a de facto or easily recognizable indication that a product contains GE ingredients.

Consumers express a clear preference for labels visible to the naked eye. Nearly nine out of ten in a recent survey favored printed, on-package information over scannable bar codes for labels indicating whether food at the grocery store contains GE ingredients, and only 8% preferred the scannable code. Other methods in the legislation that do not involve scannable codes would be significantly more difficult for consumers to use. Navigating a corporate website or dialing a customer call center would each require consumers to go through a multi-step process simply to determine if a food contains GE ingredients.

While Consumers Union agrees with the goal of establishing a uniform national standard for disclosure of GE food ingredients, this bill does not accomplish that goal. In fact, it does the opposite—prohibiting states from exercising their ability to protect consumers through labels while failing to create a credible, clear, unambiguous federal labeling requirement. Furthermore, this bill creates hurdles for consumers to determine quickly and easily while shopping if a product contains GE ingredients.

Consumers have said overwhelmingly that they want GE food to be labeled as such, and states have responded to their requests. The House should not disregard these views by eliminating state laws relating to GE food labeling and replacing them with a vague program that gives USDA excessive latitude in implementation. We therefore urge you to vote no on S. 764, and instead encourage you to continue working toward a uniform solution that serves the interests of both food producers and consumers.

Sincerely,

JEAN HALLORAN,
Director, Food Policy Initiatives.

JULY 11, 2016.

*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Re GMO Labeling Bill—OPPOSE

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned food safety, farm, environmental, and consumer advocacy organizations and food corporations, and the millions of members we represent across the United States, we strongly oppose the new Roberts/Stabenow legislation on GMO food labeling. The bill was passed by the Senate last week and is expected to come to the House floor this week.

The process that created this legislation has been profoundly undemocratic and a violation of basic legislative practice. The bill addresses a critical issue for the American public, yet it was neither subject to a single hearing nor any testimony whatsoever. Rather, the bill's preemption of the democratically decided-upon labeling laws of several states, and seed laws of numerous states and municipalities, is the result of non-transparent "bargaining" between two senators and industry interest groups.

As explained in more detail below, we oppose the bill because it is actually a non-la-

beling bill under the guise of a mandatory labeling bill. It exempts major portions of current and future GMO foods from labeling; it is on its face discriminatory against low income, rural and elderly populations; it is a gross violation of the sovereignty of numerous states around the nation; and it provides no enforcement against those who violate the law.

(1) No mandatory standards—The Senate bill itself prescribes no mandatory standards for GMO labeling. Rather, it preempts the labeling laws of several states including Vermont, Connecticut, Maine and Alaska based exclusively on a multi-year discretionary process determined solely by an as of yet unknown, future USDA Secretary.

(2) A vast number of current and future GE foods will be exempt from any labeling—Either intentionally, or through poor drafting and lack of scientific expertise, the novel definition of "bioengineering" under the bill would exclude from labeling a vast number of current foods produced with genetic engineering, including those where the "modification" is "found in nature," those in which technology cannot as yet detect the novel genetic material, and foods made with non in vitro recombinant DNA techniques, such as new generations of food made with RNAi and so-called "gene-editing" techniques. In fact, 99% of all GMO food COULD be exempt from labeling as the bill leaves it entirely up to a future USDA Secretary to determine what "amount" of GMO ingredients in a food qualifies it for labeling. If that Secretary were to decide on a high percentage of GMO content, it would exempt virtually all processed GMO foods which comprise more than 99% of all GMO foods on the market.

(3) Discrimination against rural, low income and elderly populations—The bill anticipates that GMO labeling will be done primarily through QR codes ("digital" labeling). Because of their lack of access to smart phones, more than 50% of rural and low income populations, and more than 65% of the elderly, will have no access to these labels. This impact will fall disproportionately on minority communities. Millions more that do have smart phones may not be able to access these QR codes because they cannot afford to maintain their data service or their neighborhoods do not have adequate network coverage. The study of the efficacy of QR codes outlined in the bill is to take place significantly AFTER any labeling is established and in the marketplace. The results of such a study, if any, may take many years to clarify and codify. Such a "study" provision is clearly not sufficient to obviate the bill of an unconstitutional discriminatory impact.

(4) Violation of State sovereignty by specifically preempting GMO seed laws and potentially numerous other laws and regulations—The bill not only preempts state food labeling laws, but also specifically preempts GMO seed labeling laws, such as those in Vermont and Virginia that are designed to help farmers determine what seeds to buy and plant. Additionally, either intentionally or through poor drafting, the bill could be interpreted to be a preemption of more than 100 different state and municipal laws and regulations throughout the nation.

(5) No enforcement against those who violate mandatory GMO labeling—The bill provides no civil or criminal penalties whatsoever against those not in compliance with GMO labeling requirements. The bill specifically excludes the capacity of the USDA to order any recall of misbranded food, even in cases where a product has been produced with genetic engineering but the corporation involved purposely decides to violate the law and not label.

For this and other reasons, including the bill's definitions being in direct conflict with regulations under the National Organic Food

Production Act, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the international Codex Alimentarius, the undersigned organizations and companies urge you to VOTE NO on this misguided, inherently discriminatory bill. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Center for Food Safety, Food and Water Watch, Abundance Cooperative Market, Beyond Pesticides, Biosafety Alliance, Cedar Circle Farm and Education Center, Central Park West CSA, Citizens for GMO Labeling, Council for Responsible Genetics, Crop CSA, Crush Wine and Spirits, Dr. Bronner's, East New York Farms, Empire State Consumer Project, Family Farm Defenders, Farm Aid, Food Democracy Now.

Foundation Earth, Friends of the Earth, Genesis Farm, Greenpeace, GMO Action Alliance, GMO Free NY, GMO Free USA, GMO Inside, Good Earth Natural Foods, iEat Green, LLC, Institute for Responsible Technology, International Center for Technology Assessment, Katchkie Farm, Keep the Soil in Organic Coalition, Kezialain Farm.

Label GMOs, LIC Brewery, Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association, Midwest Organic & Sustainable Education Service, Miskell's Premium Organics, Moms Across America, National Family Farm Coalition, National Organic Coalition, Nature's Path, Nine Mile Market, Non-GMO Project, Nutiva, Northeast Organic Dairy Producers Alliance, Northeast Organic Farming Association, Northeast Organic Farming Association of New York, Northeast Organic Farming Association of New Hampshire, Northeast Organic Farming Association of Vermont, NYC H20.

Oregon Right to Know, Organic Consumers Association, Organic Farmers' Agency for Relationship Marketing, Inc., Organic Seed Growers and Trade Association, Our Family Farms, PCC Natural Markets, Pesticide Action Network North America, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Presence Marketing, Regeneration Vermont, Riverside-Salem United Church of Christ/Disciples of Christ, Rodale Institute, Rumiano Cheese Company.

Rural Advancement Foundation International, Rural Advancement Foundation International USA, Rural Vermont, Sierra Club, Slow Food California, Slow Food Hudson Valley, Slow Food North Shore, Slow Food USA, Soil Not Oil Coalition, Sunnyside CSA, The Cornucopia Institute, The Organic & Non-GMO Report, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, Vermont Public Interest Research Group, Vermont Right to Know GMOs Coalition, Wood Prairie Family Farm.

[The New York Times, July 6, 2016]

A FLAWED APPROACH TO LABELING
GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD

(By the Editorial Board)

The Senate is expected to vote as early as Thursday on a bill that would require businesses to label genetically modified foods. Unfortunately, it would allow companies to use confusing electronic codes for scanning instead of simple, clear labels.

This bill, a bipartisan compromise negotiated by Senator Pat Roberts, Republican of Kansas, and Senator Debbie Stabenow, Democrat of Michigan, is being pushed through Congress because some lawmakers from farm states want to pre-empt a Vermont law that requires labeling for some genetically modified foods that went into effect on July 1 (Vermont is giving companies six months to comply) and to prevent other states from enacting similar laws. The Senate bill follows an failed effort in March to block state labeling laws. The House passed a bill last year

that would pre-empt states from enforcing such laws.

While most scientists say that genetically modified foods do not pose a risk to human health, consumers should have a right to more information about what they are eating. Polls have found that a vast majority of Americans favor mandatory labels. Dozens of countries, including all 28 members of the European Union and Australia, already require similar disclosures.

Researchers have found that labels do not dissuade people from consuming genetically engineered food, which has been a big worry of farm groups and businesses. It is no surprise then that some companies, like Campbell Soup, have voluntarily agreed to label their products.

The biggest problem with the Senate bill is that—instead of requiring a simple label, as the Vermont law does—it would allow food companies to put the information in electronic codes that consumers would have to scan with smartphones or at scanners installed by grocery stores. The only reason to do this would be to make the information less accessible to the public.

Another problem is that the bill might not cover some kinds of genetic engineering. The Food and Drug Administration warned that the bill “would result in a somewhat narrow scope of coverage”—for example, food that includes oil made from genetically engineered soybeans might not need to be labeled.

The bill’s sponsors, however, contend that under the Department of Agriculture’s analysis, the bill would require labeling of products that contain genetically engineered soybeans and refined oils. This lack of clarity is troubling, and certainly needs to be resolved. Exempting large categories of genetically modified foods would make the labels useless.

In addition to Vermont, labeling laws have been passed in Connecticut and Maine, but those measures will go into effect only if neighboring states adopt similar legislation. Clearly, a strong federal standard would be preferable to a patchwork of state rules. But the Senate bill needs more work.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, Vermont’s GMO labeling law, Act 120, was signed into law in 2014 after years of hearings, testimony, and debate. It was the first-in-the-Nation GMO labeling law, but Americans should understand that 64 nations around the world have GMO labeling. That law was passed by a vote of 28-2 in the Vermont Senate and by 114-30 in the House. It garnered support from Republicans and Democrats. The reason it did is that labeling is simply giving consumers information that they can use in deciding whether they want to buy a particular product or not. GMO labeling tells consumers whether the product contains GMOs.

Some of its opponents oppose this largely because they think consumers aren’t entitled to that information even though they believe that GMOs are tremendous. But if they want to brag about GMOs, why don’t they want to label GMO products so consumers can make their own decisions? Now what we have is a situation in which the legislation we are going to be considering says that we will put a label on but not one that you can read.

The label that would be ascribed would allow manufacturers to decide to put on “GMO contained herein”—and that is in English—just like a calorie label or how much salt is in there.

It would also give them the option of using, in effect, a barcode whereby, when you are shopping and you have got to get home to make dinner and you have got to take a son or a daughter out to a play practice or to a sports game, you have to take your iPhone, scan the barcode, go to a Web site, and then investigate the Web site as to whether or not that can of black beans contains GMOs. Who has time to do that? How is that a practical option?

The other option for the company is to put on a 1-800 number, where you are probably getting a call center overseas, and you are talking to somebody about the beans that you are buying at the co-op in Burlington. Folks who are busy mountain women don’t have time to do that, so let’s get real.

This bill that the Senate has sent over is dumb. If you want to label something, use English. That is all you have to do, and we should accept the fact for our consumers, the people we represent. If they want to know something, why not tell them?

I applaud Campbell Soup for deciding it is just going to put GMO labels on the products and will let the consumers decide. Let’s kill this bill. Let’s get a national standard that uses English.

□ 1330

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

I appreciate so much my colleague from Vermont being concerned about the time that mountain women have for looking at their beans.

I want to tell you, we have been eating genetically modified food since the beginning of time, Mr. Speaker, all of us have. Anybody who raises a garden knows that you collect your good seeds, and you try to use them over and over and over again because you have a good product.

People have been modifying food genetically, again, from the beginning of time. We try to breed good cattle with good cattle. We have been doing that since we have had any sense about what was good and what was bad in terms of our food. It has been going on a long time.

Guess what?

I just love my heirloom tomatoes, and I am looking forward to a whole bunch of them this summer.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to talk about S. 764, the GMO labeling requirements. The labeling requirement provides flexibility to food manufacturers by giving them a variety of options to meet disclosure requirements.

My colleague talked about the Vermont Legislature being bipartisan. The Senate bill was very bipartisan. For instance, a product may have a label with text explaining its contents or it may have a QR code or an electronic link to identify bioengineered

products. The food manufacturer chooses their preferred method of disclosure.

To ensure ease of use, S. 764 requires the U.S. Department of Agriculture to conduct a study to identify potential roadblocks consumers may encounter when trying to access the disclosure information. The measure allows food manufacturers of all sizes adequate time to comply with the law’s requirements and provides additional protections for small businesses.

This bill represents a bipartisan compromise on this issue, and I commend this rule and the underlying bill to my colleagues.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would just point out to the gentleman that 88 percent of consumers said they would prefer on-package labeling for genetically engineered food rather than some QR code.

Again, what this bill is about is trying to appease industry. I would say to my friends, if you want to know why we are appealing to certain industry, just follow the money because that is how so many pieces of legislation in this Republican-controlled House are crafted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. And if we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation, which would allow the Attorney General to bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI’s terrorist watch list.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question so that our ranking member can bring up his amendment to prevent suspected terrorists, people who are on the FBI’s no-fly list, people who can’t fly on an airplane because the FBI has determined it is too dangerous to the American public to allow these people to fly. But under existing law, they can legally buy a gun of their choice at a gun store. That is wrong. We all know it is wrong. Eighty-five percent of the American people believe that is wrong and support this measure.

We believe that terrorists, that criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill should not be able to have easy access to guns. Background checks and the no fly, no buy legislation are the two ways to make it tougher for them to get guns.

We are getting ready, under the Republican leadership, to run out of here and take weeks' worth of vacation without addressing this issue. I think it is shameful.

We have had 34,000 deaths by someone using a gun since the Sandy Hook tragedy 3½ years ago. We have had 1,196 mass shootings since the Sandy Hook tragedy. We have held 31 moments of silence on this floor for people who have been killed in mass shootings, but we have had zero votes on any gun violence prevention legislation. That is wrong.

The background check bill that we have before us is a bipartisan bill. As a matter of fact, there are 197 Members of Congress who are the coauthors of that bill, Democrats and Republicans. Ninety percent of the American people support it.

Why won't the Republican leadership allow that bill to be voted on here on the floor?

Every day there is another gun violence tragedy. We just had yesterday the memorial for the tragic situation in Dallas, Texas, where five police officers were murdered by someone using a gun.

It is not a partisan issue. When somebody takes a gun and goes to kill someone, they don't ask if they are Democrats or if they are Republicans. We need to put the partisan strife aside and deal with this. We need to come to this floor and work on solutions that will help keep the people who sent us to Washington, D.C., safe. It is long past time.

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, right outside of my district, two individuals with AK-47s held up an armored car. They shot one of the guards, and they took off and ended up in my district where police stopped them. One of them shot at the local police officer. He was able to hit him with his car. They arrested him. The other one with his AK-47 took off on the run. Two SWAT teams, the FBI, and the local police were out there trying to hunt this guy down with an AK-47.

This is personal. This could happen in any of our districts. It is real personal for me because one of those cops looking for this guy was my son. I don't want my son or any of your sons having to go up against some criminal with any kind of gun, the least of which would be a long gun that would pierce most of the protection they have.

Let's bring this bill to the floor. Let's get this thing done.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

The Republicans are about to leave town, and I don't know whether to be happy or sad. Sad because there are so many important issues that we need to consider here that we are not doing, whether it is gun violence or dealing with the Zika virus, but happy in the sense that we won't have to deal with terrible pieces of legislation like the two bills that are being brought before us under this rule.

The so-called Conscience Protection Act is not about protecting anybody's conscience. We already have a law that does that. This is about denying a woman access to abortion services. This is about empowering a woman's boss to make the decision as to whether or not she could have access to abortion services.

When the gentlewoman says, "no, it is not; no, it is not," I would remind her that when you deny someone insurance coverage for a healthcare procedure, in most cases, that means that you deny them access because a woman, especially a low-income woman, couldn't afford those services.

So if you think that a woman's boss ought to be in control of her health care, then vote for this terrible bill. But I hope a majority of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, will see through this and reject it.

The second bill is this terrible GMO labeling bill. As my colleague from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) said: If you want a labeling bill, then have a labeling bill. Label it. Make it clear to people. Give consumers the access to the information that they overwhelmingly want.

It is beyond the ability of the people that run this Congress to give the people of this country what they want. The vast majority want transparency, and, instead, we get this GMO bill that is confusing, that will make it impossible for some consumers to have access to information about whether or not a product contains GMOs or not.

This is not about the safety or the science of GMOs. This is about consumers' right to know. I mean, give people the information so they can make their own decisions.

Who are we in this Congress to deny people the information that they want?

It is about time we do what the American people want.

Vote "no" on the rule. Vote "no" on both of these pieces of legislation. Vote "no" on the previous question so we can finally have a debate on gun safety.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would like to remind my colleague—perhaps he has forgotten—that the House dealt with the Zika crisis and the Zika virus. We sent a bill over to the Senate, and it was the Democrat Members of the Senate that prevented that bill from being debated and voted on in the Senate. We have done our job

in the House of Representatives on a bipartisan basis. We are doing our job in the House of Representatives. I believe we passed 24 bills in this House on Monday alone. So we are doing our job, Mr. Speaker. We have problems with our colleagues' counterparts on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say again, the S. 304 does not stop a woman's choice. It is important, though, for us to understand what is at stake if we don't pass S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act. Not only will the State of California be allowed to continue to violate Federal law, but it is likely that other States will follow suit with similarly drafted rules and regulations, forcing more and more churches, religious charities, and employers to decide between honoring the tenets of their faith and helping their employees by providing health insurance.

Further, S. 304 allows healthcare providers to file a civil right of action when they face discrimination by government or subsidiary agencies. Currently, the only recourse a healthcare provider has available is to appeal to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office of Civil Rights. Recall that this was the same office that conveniently reinterpreted the Weldon Amendment, allowing the California Department of Managed Health Care to force churches to pay for elective abortions.

Additionally, the Office of Civil Rights has been notoriously slow to adjudicate complaints. The groups who filed the appeal in the California case waited more than 2 years for a decision. And a nurse who was forced to participate in an abortion and then required to reassemble the parts of a dismembered baby waited 3 years for her complaint to be resolved. That is unconscionable.

It has become clear that healthcare providers cannot rely on HHS and the Office of Civil Rights to defend healthcare providers from discrimination. S. 304 provides this protection and gives these entities recourse when they choose not to participate in or facilitate abortion.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule also provides for consideration of a motion to concur with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 764, GMO labeling requirements. This bill leverages Congress' authority to regulate interstate commerce and will establish a uniform standard for labeling bioengineered foods that is easy for consumers to access and understand.

This standard provides food manufacturers with regulatory certainty and a single, national standard with which they must comply, rather than a patchwork of dozens of State and local regulations that vary from a complex list of details to no labeling at all.

Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing, though not surprising, to hear my colleagues criticize the Conscience Protection Act. Congress has a long history of providing freedom of conscience protections, and this bill ensures that healthcare providers are protected and can continue serving their patients, customers, and communities as they have been, without threat of government coercion or retaliation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 822 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated

the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 820 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. 5538.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTINGER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1344

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. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. PITTINGER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 13, 2016, amendment No. 75 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-683 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 33 by Mr. POLIS of Colorado.

Amendment No. 34 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendments En Bloc by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 43 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 249, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

AYES—177

Adams	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Aguilar	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Bass	Butterfield	Clay
Beatty	Capps	Cleaver
Becerra	Capuano	Clyburn
Bera	Cardenas	Cohen
Beyer	Carney	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Conyers
Bonamici	Cartwright	Courtney
Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
F.	Castro (TX)	Cummings
Brady (PA)	Chu, Judy	Davis (CA)
Brown (FL)	Ciulline	Davis, Danny

DeFazio Kirkpatrick
DeGette Kuster
Delaney Langevin
DeLauro Larsen (WA)
DelBene Larson (CT)
DeSaulnier Lawrence
Deutch Lee
Diaz-Balart Levin
Dingell Lewis
Doggett Lieu, Ted
Doyle, Michael Lipinski
F. Loeb sack
Duckworth Lofgren
Edwards Sarbanes
Ellison Lowenthal
Engel Lowey
Eshoo Lujan Grisham
Esty (NM)
Farr Lujan, Ben Ray
Foster (NM)
Frankel (FL) Lynch
Fudge Maloney
Gabbard Carolyn
Gallego Maloney, Sean
Graham Matsui
Grayson McCollum
Green, Al McDermott
Green, Gene McGovern
Grijalva McNeerney
Gutiérrez Meeks
Hahn Meng
Heck (WA) Moore
Higgins Moulton
Himes Murphy (FL)
Hinojosa Nadler
Honda Napolitano
Hoyer Neal
Huffman Nolan
Israel Norcross
Jackson Lee O'Rourke
Jeffries Pallone
Johnson (GA) Pascrell
Johnson, E. B. Payne
Kaptur Pelosi
Keating Perlmutter
Kennedy Peters
Kildee Pingree
Kilmer Pocan
Kind Polis
Price (NC)

NOES—249

Abraham Crenshaw
Aderholt Culberson
Allen Curbelo (FL)
Amash Davidson
Amodei Davis, Rodney
Ashford Denham
Babin Dent
Barletta DeSantis
Barr DesJarlais
Barton Dold
Benishek Donovan
Bilirakis Duffy
Bishop (GA) Duncan (TN)
Bishop (MI) Ellmers (NC)
Bishop (UT) Emmer (MN)
Black Farenthold
Blackburn Fincher
Blum Fitzpatrick
Bost Fleischmann
Boustany Fleming
Brady (TX) Flores
Brat Forbes
Bridenstine Fortenberry
Brooks (AL) Foxx
Brooks (IN) Franks (AZ)
Buchanan Frelinghuysen
Buck Garamendi
Bucshon Garrett
Burgess Kline
Byrne Gibson
Calvert Gohmert
Carter (GA) LaHood
Carter (TX) Gosar
Chabot Lamborn
Chaffetz Granger
Clawson (FL) Graves (GA)
Coffman Graves (LA)
Cole Graves (MO)
Collins (GA) Griffith
Collins (NY) Grothman
Comstock Guinta
Conaway Guthrie
Cook Hanna
Cooper Hardy
Costa Harper
Costello (PA) Harris
Cramer Hartzler
Crawford Heck (NV)

Quigley McCaull
Rangel McClintock
Rice (NY) McHenry
Richmond McKinley
Roybal-Allard McMorris
Ruiz Rodgers
Ruppersberger McSally
Rush Meadows
Ryan (OH) Meehan
Sánchez, Linda Messer
T. Mica
Sanchez, Loretta Miller (FL)
Sarbanes Miller (MI)
Schakowsky Moolenaar
Schiff Mooney (WV)
Schradler Mullin
Scott (VA) Mulvaney
Scott, David Murphy (PA)
Serrano Neugebauer
Sewell (AL) Newhouse
Sherman Noem
Sinema Nugent
Sires Nunes
Slaughter Olson
Smith (WA) Palazzo
Speier Paulsen
Swalwell (CA) Perry
Takano Peterson
Thompson (CA) Pittenger
Thompson (MS) Pitts
Titus Smith (NE)
Tonko Smith (NJ)
Torres Smith (TX)
Tsongas Posey
Van Hollen Price, Tom
Vargas Ratcliffe
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Crowley Pearce
Duncan (SC) Poe (TX)
Hastings Rooney (FL)

□ 1407

Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, BISHOP of Michigan, DUFFY, TROTT, and GARAMENDI changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted: Rollcall No. 433, “yea.”

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) 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 240, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

AYES—187

Adams Blumenauer
Agullar Bonamici
Bass Boyle, Brendan
Beatty F.
Becerra Brady (PA)
Bera Brown (FL)
Beyer Brownley (CA)

Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa

NOES—240

Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Kind
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Dold
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Knight	Olson	Smith (MO)	Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Pingree	Love	Peterson	Smith (TX)
Labrador	Palazzo	Smith (NE)	Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan	Lucas	Pittenger	Stefanik
LaHood	Palmer	Smith (NJ)	Cohen	Jones	Pollack	Luetkemeyer	Pitts	Stewart
LaMalfa	Paulsen	Smith (TX)	Connolly	Kaptur	Price (NC)	Lujan Grisham	Poliquin	Stivers
Lamborn	Perry	Stewart	Conyers	Keating	Quigley	(NM)	Pompeo	Stutzman
Lance	Peterson	Stivers	Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Rangel	Lummis	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Latta	Pittenger	Stutzman	Costa	Kennedy	Reed	MacArthur	Price, Tom	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Pitts	Thompson (PA)	Courtney	Kildee	Rice (NY)	Marchant	Ratchliffe	Tiberi
Long	Poliquin	Thornberry	Crowley	Kilmer	Richmond	Marino	Reichert	Tipton
Loudermilk	Pompeo	Tiberi	Cummings	Kind	Roybal-Allard	Massie	Renacci	Trott
Love	Posey	Tipton	Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Ruiz	McCarthy	Ribble	Turner
Lucas	Price, Tom	Trott	Davis, Danny	Kuster	Ruppersberger	McCaul	Rice (SC)	Upton
Luetkemeyer	Ratchliffe	Turner	DeFazio	Langevin	Rush	McClintock	Rigell	Valadao
Lummis	Reed	Upton	DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)	McHenry	Roby	Vela
MacArthur	Reichert	Valadao	Delaney	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	McKinley	Roe (TN)	Wagner
Marchant	Renacci	Waladao	DeLauro	Lawrence	T.	McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Marino	Ribble	Veasey	DeBene	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta	Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Massie	Rice (SC)	Wagner	DeSaulnier	Levin	Sanford	McSally	Rohrabacher	Walker
McCarthy	Rigell	Walberg	Deutch	Lewis	Sarbanes	Meadows	Rokita	Walorski
McCaul	Roby	Walden	Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky	Meehan	Rooney (FL)	Walters, Mimi
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Walker	Doggett	Lipinski	Schiff	Messer	Ros-Lehtinen	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Walorski	Doyle, Michael	Loebsack	Schrader	Mica	Roskam	Webster (FL)
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Walters, Mimi	F.	Lofgren	Scott (VA)	Miller (FL)	Ross	Wenstrup
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Weber (TX)	Duckworth	Lowenthal	Scott, David	Miller (MI)	Rothfus	Westerman
Rodgers	Rokita	Webster (FL)	Edwards	Lowe	Serrano	Moolenaar	Rouzer	Westmoreland
McSally	Rooney (FL)	Wenstrup	Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray	Sewell (AL)	Mooney (WV)	Royce	Whitfield
Meadows	Roskam	Westerman	Engel	(NM)	Sherman	Mullin	Russell	Williams
Meehan	Ross	Westmoreland	Eshoo	Lynch	Sinema	Mulvaney	Salmon	Wilson (SC)
Messer	Rothfus	Whitfield	Esty	Maloney,	Sires	Murphy (PA)	Scalise	Wittman
Mica	Rouzer	Williams	Farr	Carolyn	Slaughter	Neugebauer	Schweikert	Womack
Miller (FL)	Royce	Wilson (SC)	Fitzpatrick	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)	Newhouse	Scott, Austin	Woodall
Miller (MI)	Russell	Wittman	Foster	Matsui	Speier	Noem	Sensenbrenner	Yoder
Moolenaar	Salmon	Womack	Frankel (FL)	McCollum	Swalwell (CA)	Nugent	Sessions	Yoho
Mooney (WV)	Sanford	Woodall	Fudge	McDermott	Takano	Nunes	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Mullin	Scalise	Yoder	Gabbard	McGovern	Thompson (CA)	Olson	Shuster	Young (IA)
Mulvaney	Schweikert	Yoho	Gallego	McNerney	Thompson (MS)	Palazzo	Simpson	Young (IN)
Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)	Garamendi	Meeks	Titus	Palmer	Smith (MO)	Zeldin
Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner	Young (IA)	Graham	Meng	Tonko	Paulsen	Smith (NE)	Zinke
Newhouse	Sessions	Young (IN)	Grayson	Moore	Torres	Perry	Smith (NJ)	
Noem	Shimkus	Zeldin	Grijalva	Moulton	Tsongas			
Nugent	Shuster	Zinke	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)	Van Hollen			
Nunes	Simpson		Hahn	Nadler	Vargas	Hastings	Poe (TX)	
			Hanna	Napolitano	Veasey	Pearce	Takai	
			Heck (WA)	Neal	Velázquez			
			Herrera Beutler	Nolan	Visclosky			
			Higgins	Norcross	Walz			
			Himes	O'Rourke	Wasserman			
			Hinojosa	Pallone	Schultz			
			Honda	Pascrell	Waters, Maxine			
			Hoyer	Payne	Watson Coleman			
			Huffman	Pelosi	Welch			
			Israel	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)			
			Jeffries	Peters	Yarmuth			

NOT VOTING—6

Brady (TX)	Hastings	Poe (TX)
Eshoo	Pearce	Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1411

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 246, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

AYES—183

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Carney
Aguilar	F.	Carson (IN)
Ashford	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Bass	Brown (FL)	Castor (FL)
Beatty	Brownley (CA)	Castro (TX)
Becerra	Bustos	Chu, Judy
Bera	Butterfield	Cicilline
Beyer	Capps	Clark (MA)
Blumenauer	Capuano	Clarke (NY)
Bonamici	Cárdenas	Clay

Abraham	Crawford	Guinta
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Allen	Cuellar	Hardy
Amash	Culberson	Harper
Amodei	Curbelo (FL)	Harris
Babin	Davidson	Hartzler
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Heck (NV)
Barr	Denham	Hensarling
Barton	Dent	Hice, Jody B.
Benishek	DeSantis	Hill
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Holding
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Bishop (MI)	Dold	Huelskamp
Bishop (UT)	Donovan	Huizenga (MI)
Black	Duffy	Hultgren
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Blum	Duncan (TN)	Hurd (TX)
Bost	Ellmers (NC)	Hurt (VA)
Boustany	Emmer (MN)	Issa
Brady (TX)	Farenthold	Jackson Lee
Brat	Fincher	Jenkins (KS)
Bridenstine	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (AL)	Fleming	Johnson (OH)
Brooks (IN)	Flores	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Forbes	Jolly
Buck	Fortenberry	Jordan
Bucshon	Foxo	Joyce
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Katko
Byrne	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (MS)
Calvert	Garrett	Kelly (PA)
Carter (GA)	Gibbs	King (IA)
Carter (TX)	Gibson	King (NY)
Chabot	Gohmert	Kingzinger (IL)
Chaffetz	Goodlatte	Kline
Clawson (FL)	Gosar	Knight
Coffman	Gowdy	Labrador
Cole	Granger	LaHood
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	LaMalfa
Collins (NY)	Graves (LA)	Lamborn
Constock	Graves (MO)	Lance
Conaway	Green, Al	Latta
Cook	Green, Gene	LoBiondo
Costello (PA)	Griffith	Long
Cramer	Grothman	Loudermilk

Wasserman	Schultz
Pallone	Waters, Maxine
Walz	Watson Coleman
Wasserman	Welch
Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Waters, Maxine	Yarmuth
Watson Coleman	
Welch	
Wilson (FL)	
Yarmuth	

NOT VOTING—4

Hastings	Poe (TX)
Pearce	Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1416

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 248, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

AYES—181

Adams	Brady (PA)	Chu, Judy
Aguilar	Brown (FL)	Cicilline
Ashford	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Bass	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Butterfield	Clay
Becerra	Capps	Cleaver
Bera	Capuano	Clyburn
Beyer	Cárdenas	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Conyers
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cooper
Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)	Courtney
F.	Castro (TX)	Crowley

Cummings Kildee
 Davis (CA) Kilmer
 Davis, Danny Kind
 DeFazio Kirkpatrick
 DeGette Kuster
 Delaney Langevin
 DeLauro Larsen (WA)
 DeBene Larson (CT)
 DeSaulnier Lawrence
 Deutch Lee
 Dingell Levin
 Doggett Lewis
 Doyle, Michael F. Lieu, Ted
 Duckworth Lipinski
 Edwards Loebsock
 Ellison Lofgren
 Engel Lowenthal
 Eshoo Lowey
 Esty Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Farr Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
 Foster Lynch
 Frankel (FL) Maloney,
 Fudge Carolyn
 Gabbard Maloney, Sean
 Gallego Matsui
 Garamendi McCollum
 Graham McDermott
 Grayson McGovern
 Green, Al McNeerney
 Green, Gene Meeks
 Grijalva Meng
 Gutiérrez Moore
 Hahn Moulton
 Heck (WA) Murphy (FL)
 Higgins Nadler
 Himes Hinojosa
 Hinojosa Napolitano
 Honda Neal
 Hoyer Nolan
 Huffman Norcross
 Israel O'Rourke
 Jackson Lee Pallone
 Jeffries Pascrell
 Johnson (GA) Payne
 Johnson, E. B. Pelosi
 Kaptur Perlmutter
 Keating Peters
 Kelly (IL) Pingree
 Kennedy Pocan

NOES—248

Abraham Culberson
 Aderholt Curbelo (FL)
 Allen Davidson
 Amash Davis, Rodney
 Amodei Denham
 Babin Dent
 Barletta DeSantis
 Barr DesJarlais
 Barton Diaz-Balart
 Benishek Dold
 Bilirakis Donovan
 Bishop (MI) Duffy
 Bishop (UT) Duncan (SC)
 Black Duncan (TN)
 Blackburn Ellmers (NC)
 Blum Emmer (MN)
 Bost Farenthold
 Boustany Fincher
 Brady (TX) Fitzpatrick
 Brat Fleischmann
 Bridenstine Fleming
 Brooks (AL) Flores
 Brooks (IN) Forbes
 Buchanan Fortenberry
 Buck Foxx
 Bucshon Franks (AZ)
 Burgess Frelinghuysen
 Byrne Garrett
 Calvert Gibbs
 Carter (GA) Gibson
 Carter (TX) Gohmert
 Chabot Goodlatte
 Chaffetz Gosar
 Clawson (FL) Gowdy
 Coffman Granger
 Cole Graves (GA)
 Collins (GA) Graves (LA)
 Collins (NY) Graves (MO)
 Comstock Griffith
 Conaway Grothman
 Cook Guinta
 Costa Guthrie
 Costello (PA) Hanna
 Cramer Hardy
 Crawford Harper
 Crenshaw Harris
 Cuellar Hartzler

Polis Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Neal
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4
 Hastings Poe (TX)
 Pearce Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1420

So the en bloc amendments were re-jected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) 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 will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-vice, and there were—ayes 202, noes 225, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

AYES—202

Adams Bustos
 Agular Butterfield
 Ashford Capps
 Bass Capuano
 Beatty Cárdenas
 Becerra Carney
 Bera Carson (IN)
 Beyer Cartwright
 Bishop (GA) Castor (FL)
 Blumenauer Castro (TX)
 Bonamici Chu, Judy
 Boyle, Brendan Ciocline
 F. Clark (MA)
 Brady (PA) Clarke (NY)
 Brown (FL) Clay
 Brownley (CA) Cleaver

Stefanik Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Delaney
 DeLauro
 DeBene
 Dent
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dold
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fitzpatrick
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Gibson
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Guinta
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanna
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee

NOES—225

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costa
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Cuellar
 Crenshaw
 Hill
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Latta
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 Crenshaw
 Hill
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Knight
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Latta
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley

McMorris	Rice (SC)	Thompson (PA)	Grothman	Massie	Rush	Newhouse	Roskam	Thornberry
Rodgers	Rigell	Thornberry	Guinta	McCarthy	Russell	Noem	Ross	Tiberi
McSally	Roby	Tiberi	Guthrie	McCaul	Salmon	Nolan	Roybal-Allard	Tipton
Meadows	Roe (TN)	Tipton	Hardy	McClintock	Sanford	Norcross	Ruiz	Titus
Messer	Rogers (AL)	Trott	Harris	McHenry	Scalise	Nugent	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Turner	Hartzler	McMorris	Schweikert	Nunes	Ryan (OH)	Torres
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Valadao	Hensarling	Rodgers	Scott, Austin	O'Rourke	Sánchez, Linda	Tsongas
Miller (MI)	Rokita	Wagner	Hice, Jody B.	McSally	Sensenbrenner	Pallone	T.	Turner
Moolenaar	Rooney (FL)	Walberg	Hill	Meadows	Sessions	Pascrell	Sanchez, Loretta	Valadao
Mooney (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden	Holding	Messer	Shimkus	Sarbanes	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
Mullin	Roskam	Walker	Hudson	Mica	Shuster	Payne	Schakowsky	Vargas
Mulvaney	Ross	Walorski	Huelskamp	Miller (FL)	Smith (MO)	Pelosi	Schiff	Veasey
Murphy (PA)	Rothfus	Walters, Mimi	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)	Perlmutter	Schrader	Vela
Neugebauer	Rouzer	Weber (TX)	Hultgren	Moolenaar	Smith (NJ)	Peters	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Newhouse	Royce	Webster (FL)	Hunter	Mooney (WV)	Smith (TX)	Peterson	Scott, David	Visclosky
Noem	Russell	Wenstrup	Hurd (VA)	Mullin	Stewart	Pingree	Serrano	Walden
Nugent	Salmon	Westerman	Issa	Mulvaney	Stutzman	Pocan	Sewell (AL)	Walz
Nunes	Sanford	Westmoreland	Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (PA)	Trott	Polis	Sherman	Wasserman
Olson	Scalise	Whitfield	Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Olson	Price (NC)	Simpson	Schultz
Palazzo	Schrader	Williams	Johnson, Sam	Olson	Palazzo	Quigley	Sinema	Waters, Maxine
Palmer	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)	Jones	Palmer	Palazzo	Rangel	Sires	Watson Coleman
Perry	Scott, Austin	Wittman	Jordan	Paulsen	Palmer	Ratcliffe	Slaughter	Welch
Peterson	Sensenbrenner	Womack	Kelly (MS)	Perry	Paulsen	Reed	Smith (WA)	Westmoreland
Pittenger	Sessions	Woodall	King (IA)	Pittenger	Perry	Reichert	Speier	Whitfield
Pitts	Shimkus	Yoder	Kline	Pitts	Perry	Renacci	Stefanik	Wilson (FL)
Poliquin	Shuster	Yoho	Knight	Poliquin	Pitts	Rice (NY)	Stivers	Womack
Pompeo	Simpson	Young (AK)	Labrador	Pompeo	Poliquin	Richmond	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth
Posey	Smith (MO)	Young (IA)	LaMalfa	Pompeo	Pompeo	Rigell	Takano	Young (AK)
Price, Tom	Smith (NE)	Young (IN)	Lamborn	Posey	Pompeo	Roby	Thompson (CA)	Zinke
Ratcliffe	Smith (TX)	Zeldin	Lance	Price, Tom	Pompeo	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)	
Reed	Stewart	Zinke	LoBiondo	Ribble	Price, Tom	Rooney (FL)	Thompson (PA)	
Renacci	Stivers		Long	Rice (SC)	Rice (SC)	Ros-Lehtinen		
Ribble	Stutzman		Loudermilk	Roe (TN)	Roe (TN)			
			Love	Rogers (AL)	Rogers (AL)			
			Lucas	Rohrabacher	Rohrabacher			
			Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Rokita			
			Lummis	Rothfus	Rothfus			
			Marchant	Rouzer	Rouzer			
				Royce	Royce			

NOT VOTING—6

Graves (LA)	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)
Hastings	Pearce	Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1423

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MRS.
BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs.
BLACKBURN) on which further pro-
ceedings 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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 171, noes 258,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

AYES—171

Abraham	Bucshon	Duncan (SC)
Allen	Burgess	Duncan (TN)
Amash	Byrne	Farenthold
Babin	Carter (GA)	Fincher
Barr	Chabot	Fleming
Barton	Chaffetz	Flores
Bilirakis	Clawson (FL)	Forbes
Bishop (MI)	Coffman	Fox
Black	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Comstock	Garrett
Blum	Conaway	Gibbs
Boustany	Cook	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Cooper	Goodlatte
Brat	Crawford	Gosar
Bridenstine	Culberson	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	Davidson	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	DeSantis	Graves (LA)
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Buck	Duffy	Griffith

NOES—258

Adams	DeFazio	Jenkins (WV)
Aderholt	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Aguilar	Delaney	Johnson, E. B.
Amodei	DeLauro	Jolly
Ashford	DelBene	Joyce
Barletta	Denham	Kaptur
Bass	Dent	Katko
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Keating
Becerra	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)
Bera	Dingell	Kennedy
Beyer	Doggett	Kildee
Bishop (GA)	Dold	Kilmer
Bishop (UT)	Donovan	Kind
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	King (NY)
Bonamici	F.	Kinzinger (IL)
Bost	Duckworth	Kirkpatrick
Boyle, Brendan	Edwards	Kuster
F.	Ellison	LaHood
Brady (PA)	Ellmers (NC)	Langevin
Brown (FL)	Emmer (MN)	Larsen (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Engel	Larson (CT)
Bustos	Eshoo	Latta
Butterfield	Esty	Lawrence
Calvert	Farr	Lee
Capps	Fitzpatrick	Levin
Capuano	Fleischmann	Lewis
Cárdenas	Fortenberry	Lieu, Ted
Carney	Foster	Lipinski
Carson (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Loeb
Carter (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Loeb
Cartwright	Fudge	Lofgren
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Lowenthal
Castro (TX)	Gallego	Lowey
Chu, Judy	Garamendi	Lujan Grisham
Cicilline	Gibson	(NM)
Clark (MA)	Graham	Luján, Ben Ray
Clarke (NY)	Granger	(NM)
Clay	Grayson	Lynch
Cleaver	Green, Al	MacArthur
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Maloney,
Cohen	Grijalva	Carolyn
Cole	Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean
Collins (NY)	Hahn	Marino
Connolly	Hanna	Matsui
Conyers	Harper	McCollum
Costa	Heck (NV)	McDermott
Costello (PA)	Heck (WA)	McGovern
Costuney	Herrera Beutler	McKinley
Cramer	Higgins	McNerney
Crenshaw	Himes	Meehan
Crowley	Hinojosa	Meeks
Cuellar	Honda	Meng
Cummings	Hoyer	Moore
Curbelo (FL)	Huffman	Moulton
Davis (CA)	Israel	Murphy (FL)
Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Davis, Rodney	Jeffries	Napolitano
		Neal

NOT VOTING—4

Hastings	Poe (TX)
Pearce	Takai

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.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I
move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs.
WAGNER) having assumed the chair,
Mr. HOLDING, Acting Chair of the Com-
mittee of the Whole House on the state
of the Union, reported that that Com-
mittee, having had under consideration
the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropri-
ations for the Department of the Inter-
ior, environment, and related agencies
for the fiscal year ending September 30,
2017, and for other purposes, had come
to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursu-
ant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings
will resume on questions previously
postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following
order:

Ordering the previous question on
House Resolution 822; and adoption of
House Resolution 822, if ordered.

All electronic votes will be conducted
as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 764, NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 304, MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY WHISTLEBLOWER ACT; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 822) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 764) to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 183, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

YEAS—245

Abraham	DeSantis	Hunter
Aderholt	DesJarlais	Hurd (TX)
Allen	Diaz-Balart	Hurt (VA)
Amash	Dold	Issa
Amodei	Donovan	Jenkins (KS)
Babin	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Barletta	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Barr	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Barton	Ellmers (NC)	Jolly
Benishek	Emmer (MN)	Jones
Bilirakis	Farenthold	Jordan
Bishop (MI)	Fincher	Joyce
Bishop (UT)	Fitzpatrick	Katko
Black	Fleischmann	Kelly (MS)
Blackburn	Fleming	Kelly (PA)
Blum	Flores	King (IA)
Bost	Forbes	King (NY)
Boustany	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)
Brady (TX)	Fox	Kline
Brat	Franks (AZ)	Knight
Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Labrador
Brooks (AL)	Garrett	LaHood
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Buchanan	Gibson	Lamborn
Buck	Gohmert	Lance
Bucshon	Goodlatte	Latta
Burgess	Gosar	LoBiondo
Byrne	Gowdy	Long
Calvert	Granger	Loudermilk
Carter (GA)	Graves (GA)	Love
Carter (TX)	Graves (LA)	Lucas
Chabot	Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer
Chaffetz	Griffith	Lummis
Clawson (FL)	Grothman	MacArthur
Coffman	Guinta	Marchant
Cole	Guthrie	Marino
Collins (GA)	Hanna	Massie
Collins (NY)	Hardy	McCarthy
Comstock	Harper	McCaul
Conaway	Harris	McClintock
Cook	Hartzler	McHenry
Costello (PA)	Heck (NV)	McKinley
Cramer	Hensarling	McMorris
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers
Crenshaw	Hice, Jody B.	McSally
Culberson	Hill	Meadows
Curbelo (FL)	Holding	Meehan
Davidson	Hudson	Messer
Davis, Rodney	Huelskamp	Mica
Denham	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)
Dent	Hultgren	Miller (MI)

Moolenaar	Rogers (AL)	Thornberry
Mooney (WV)	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
Mullin	Rohrabacher	Tipton
Mulvaney	Rokita	Trott
Murphy (PA)	Rooney (FL)	Turner
Neugebauer	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Newhouse	Roskam	Valadao
Noem	Ross	Wagner
Nugent	Rothfus	Walberg
Nunes	Rouzer	Walden
Olson	Royce	Walker
Palazzo	Russell	Walorski
Palmer	Salmon	Walters, Mimi
Paulsen	Sanford	Weber (TX)
Perry	Scalise	Webster (FL)
Peterson	Schweikert	Wenstrup
Pittenger	Scott, Austin	Westerman
Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Westmoreland
Poliquin	Sessions	Whitfield
Pompeo	Shimkus	Williams
Posey	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Price, Tom	Simpson	Wittman
Ratcliffe	Smith (MO)	Womack
Reed	Smith (NE)	Woodall
Reichert	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Renacci	Smith (TX)	Yoho
Ribble	Stefanik	Young (AK)
Rice (SC)	Stewart	Young (IA)
Rigell	Stivers	Young (IN)
Roby	Stutzman	Zeldin
Roe (TN)	Thompson (PA)	Zinke

NAYS—183

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.	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Himes	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Price (NC)
Bustos	Honda	Quigley
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rangel
Capps	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Israel	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Jeffries	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Ciçilline	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schiff
Clay	Kind	Schrader
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kuster	Scott, David
Cohen	Langevin	Serrano
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Conyers	Lawrence	Sinema
Cooper	Lee	Sires
Costa	Levin	Slaughter
Courtney	Lewis	Lieu, Ted
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Lipinski
Cuellar	Lipinski	Loebsack
Cummings	Lance	Lofgren
Davis (CA)	Latta	Lowenthal
Davis, Danny	LoBiondo	Lowe
DeFazio	Long	Lujan Grisham
DeGette	Long	(NM)
Delaney	Loudermilk	Luján, Ben Ray
DeLauro	Love	(NM)
DeBene	Lucas	Lynch
DeSaulnier	Luetkemeyer	Maloney, Carolyn
Deuch	Lummis	Maloney, Sean
Dingell	MacArthur	Matsui
Doggett	Marchant	McCollum
Doyle, Michael F.	Marino	McDermott
Duckworth	Massie	McGovern
Edwards	McCarthy	McNerney
Ellison	McCaul	Meeke
Engel	McHenry	Meng
Eshoo	McKinley	Moore
Esty	McMorris	Moulton
Farr	Rodgers	Murphy (FL)
Foster	McSally	Nadler
Frankel (FL)	Meadows	
	Meehan	
	Messer	
	Mica	
	Miller (FL)	
	Miller (MI)	

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings	Poe (TX)	Vela
Pearce	Takai	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1435

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ELECTING THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 826

Resolved, That Philip George Kiko of the State of Ohio, be, and is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, effective August 1, 2016.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Will the Chief Administrative Officer-designate please take the well.

The Chair will now administer the oath of office to the Chief Administrative Officer.

Mr. Kiko appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, Mr. Kiko.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 185, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

AYES—242

Abraham	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Aderholt	Buck	Culberson
Allen	Bucshon	Curbelo (FL)
Amodei	Burgess	Davidson
Babin	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Barletta	Calvert	Denham
Barr	Carter (GA)	Dent
Barton	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Benishek	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (MI)	Clawson (FL)	Dold
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Donovan
Black	Duffy	Cole
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Blum	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Bost	Comstock	Ellmers (NC)
Boustany	Conaway	Emmer (MN)
Brady (TX)	Cook	Farenthold
Brat	Costello (PA)	Fincher
Bridenstine	Cramer	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (IN)	Crawford	Fleischmann

Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa

Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rogers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Long
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter

Hastings
Kelly (IL)

Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema

NOT VOTING—6

Pearce
Poe (TX)
Smith (NE)
Takai

□ 1443

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 440, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

□ 1445

CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT OF 2016

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 822, I call up the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Pursuant to House Resolution 822, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-61 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

S. 304

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 "Conscience Protection Act of 2016".

SECTION 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:
(1) Thomas Jefferson stated a conviction common to our Nation's founders when he declared in 1809 that "[n]o provision in our Constitution ought to be dearer to man than that which protects the rights of conscience against the enterprises of the civil authority".
(2) In 1973, the Supreme Court concluded that the government must leave the abortion decision "to the medical judgment of the pregnant woman's attending physician", recognizing that a physician may choose not to participate in abor-

tion. *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, 164 (1973). The Court cited with approval a policy that "neither physician, hospital, nor hospital personnel shall be required to perform any act violative of personally-held moral principles", 410 U.S. at 143 n. 38, and cited State laws upholding this principle. *Doe v. Bolton*, 410 U.S. 179, 197-8 (1973).

(3) Congress's enactments to protect this right of conscience in health care include the Church amendment of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 300a-7), the Coats/Snowe amendment of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 238n), and the Weldon amendment approved by Congresses and Presidents of both parties every year since 2004.

(4) None of these laws explicitly provides a "private right of action" so victims of discrimination can defend their conscience rights in court, and administrative enforcement by the Department of Health and Human Services Office for Civil Rights has been lax, at times allowing cases to languish for years without resolution.

(5) Defying the Federal Weldon amendment, California's Department of Managed Health Care has mandated coverage for all elective abortions in all health plans under its jurisdiction. Other States such as New York and Washington have taken or considered similar action, and some States may go farther to require all physicians and hospitals to provide or facilitate abortions. On June 21, 2016, the Administration concluded a nearly two-year investigation of this matter by determining that California's decision to require insurance plans under the California Department for Managed Health Care authority to cover all legal abortion services did not violate the Weldon amendment. This interpretation means that individuals will have to choose between ignoring their conscience or forgoing health care coverage.

(6) The vast majority of medical professionals do not perform abortions, with 86 percent of ob/gyns unwilling to provide them in a recent study (*Obstetrics & Gynecology*, Sept. 2011) and the great majority of hospitals choosing to do so in rare cases or not at all.

(7) A health care provider's decision not to participate in an abortion, like Congress's decision not to fund most abortions, erects no new barrier to those seeking to perform or undergo abortions but leaves each party free to act as he or she wishes.

(8) Such protection poses no conflict with other Federal laws, such as the law requiring emergency stabilizing treatment for a pregnant woman and her unborn child when either is in distress (*Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act*). As the Obama administration has said, these areas of law have operated side by side for many years and both should be fully enforced (76 Federal Register 9968-77 (2011) at 9973).

(9) Reaffirming longstanding Federal policy on conscience rights and providing a right of action in cases where it is violated allows longstanding and widely supported Federal laws to work as intended.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITING GOVERNMENTAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PROVIDERS OF HEALTH SERVICES THAT ARE NOT INVOLVED IN ABORTION.

Title II of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 202 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 245 the following:

"SEC. 245A. PROHIBITING GOVERNMENTAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PROVIDERS OF HEALTH SERVICES THAT ARE NOT INVOLVED IN ABORTION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other law, the Federal Government, and any State or local government that receives Federal financial assistance, may not penalize, retaliate against, or otherwise discriminate against a health care provider on the basis that the provider does not—

"(1) perform, refer for, pay for, or otherwise participate in abortion;

"(2) provide or sponsor abortion coverage; or

NOES—185

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly

Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene

Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey

“(3) facilitate or make arrangements for any of the activities specified in this subsection.

“(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) to prevent any health care provider from voluntarily electing to participate in abortions or abortion referrals;

“(2) to prevent any health care provider from voluntarily electing to provide or sponsor abortion coverage or health benefits coverage that includes abortion;

“(3) to prevent an accrediting agency, the Federal government, or a State or local government from establishing standards of medical competency applicable only to those who have knowingly, voluntarily, and specifically elected to perform abortions, or from enforcing contractual obligations applicable only to those who, as part of such contract, knowingly, voluntarily, and specifically elect to provide abortions;

“(4) to affect, or be affected by, section 1867 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395dd, commonly referred to as the ‘Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act’); or

“(5) to supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating insurance, except as specified in subsection (a).

“(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Secretary shall designate the Director of the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health and Human Services—

“(1) to receive complaints alleging a violation of this section, section 245 of this Act, or any of subsections (b) through (e) of section 401 of the Health Programs Extension Act of 1973; and

“(2) to pursue the investigation of such complaints in coordination with the Attorney General.

“(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

“(1) **FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.**—The term ‘Federal financial assistance’ means Federal payments to cover the cost of health care services or benefits, or other Federal payments, grants, or loans to promote or otherwise facilitate health-related activities.

“(2) **HEALTH CARE PROVIDER.**—The term ‘health care provider’ means—

“(A) an individual physician, nurse, or other health care professional;

“(B) a hospital, health system, or other health care facility or organization (including a party to a proposed merger or other collaborative arrangement relating to health services, and an entity resulting therefrom);

“(C) a provider-sponsored organization, an accountable care organization, or a health maintenance organization;

“(D) a social services provider that provides or authorizes referrals for health care services;

“(E) a program of training in the health professions or an applicant to or participant in such a program;

“(F) an issuer of health insurance coverage; or

“(G) a group health plan or student health plan, or a sponsor or administrator thereof.

“(3) **STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT THAT RECEIVES FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.**—The term ‘State or local government that receives Federal financial assistance’ includes every agency and other governmental unit and subdivision of a State or local government, if such State or local government, or any agency or governmental unit or subdivision thereof, receives Federal financial assistance.

“SEC. 245B. CIVIL ACTION FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A qualified party may, in a civil action, obtain appropriate relief with regard to a designated violation.

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

“(1) **QUALIFIED PARTY.**—The term ‘qualified party’ means—

“(A) the Attorney General of the United States; or

“(B) any person or entity adversely affected by the designated violation.

“(2) **DESIGNATED VIOLATION.**—The term ‘designated violation’ means an actual or threatened violation of—

“(A) section 245 or 245A of this Act; or

“(B) any of subsections (b) through (e) of section 401 of the Health Programs Extension Act of 1973 regarding an objection to abortion.

“(c) **ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES NOT REQUIRED.**—An action under this section may be commenced, and relief may be granted, without regard to whether the party commencing the action has sought or exhausted available administrative remedies.

“(d) **DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS UNDER THIS SECTION MAY INCLUDE GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES AS WELL AS OTHERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An action under this section may be maintained against, among others, a party that is a Federal or State governmental entity. Relief in an action under this section may include money damages even if the defendant is such a governmental entity.

“(2) **DEFINITION.**—For the purposes of this subsection, the term ‘State governmental entity’ means a State, a local government within a State, and any agency or other governmental unit or subdivision of a State or of such a local government.

“(e) **NATURE OF RELIEF.**—In an action under this section, the court shall grant—

“(1) all necessary equitable and legal relief, including, where appropriate, declaratory relief and compensatory damages, to prevent the occurrence, continuance, or repetition of the designated violation and to compensate for losses resulting from the designated violation; and

“(2) to a prevailing plaintiff, reasonable attorneys’ fees and litigation expenses as part of the costs.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on S. 304 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 304.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, Congress has a long history of providing strong, bipartisan conscience and freedom protections consistent with our founding principles and the Constitution. It is about fairness. It is a cornerstone of our Constitution, which is built upon individual rights and liberties.

Look no further than the Clinton administration to find evidence of unity when it comes to conscience exemptions. President Clinton built conscience protections into managed care plans for Medicaid and Medicare regarding referrals. In 1977, as part of the Balanced Budget Act, almost identical conscience protections were applied to Medicare Choice Plans. The conference report that included these exemptions was widely supported by Democratic lawmakers like now-Vice President BIDEN, now-Secretary of State KERRY, and Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI, to name a few.

In 1998 and again in 1999, the Clinton administration took the initiative to add two separate conscience protections to the Federal employees health benefit program. Many of these protections have been renewed annually by Presidents Clinton and Bush and, yes, by President Obama.

One of these protections is the Weldon amendment, a longstanding conscience safeguard in appropriations law. This protection provides that States and localities receiving Federal funds may not discriminate against a healthcare entity on the basis that they do not “provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortions.”

Troublingly, those encountering discrimination cannot even look to the Office for Civil Rights for help. The Office for Civil Rights within HHS recently reinterpreted existing law to find a California mandate directing all health insurers to remove coverage exclusions and limitations for elective abortions to be consistent with the Weldon amendment.

Americans should not have to rely on the whim of attorneys at HHS to be protected from discrimination. This is why we are here today—to discuss fairness, to protect Americans’ rights.

Here is what the Conscience Protection Act does:

First, the bill reaffirms the protections that are found in the Weldon amendment;

Second, the bill gives discriminated individuals and entities their day in court through a private right of action; and

Third, the bill clarifies that nothing—nothing—in the legislation prevents providers from voluntarily electing to participate in abortion or makes changes to the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act.

The simple intent of this bill is to stop the government from unfairly coercing individuals and entities to provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortions.

Consider the examples of churches in California—like Skyline Church in La Mesa and Faith Baptist Church in Santa Barbara—that are currently being forced by the State to cover all legal abortion in their healthcare plans.

Or the case of a New York nurse, Cathy DeCarlo, who was forced to take part in a dismemberment of 22-week-

old unborn child. Cathy literally had to count the pieces of the unborn child, against her objection to abortion. Her lawsuit was dismissed because the conscience law lacks a private right of action.

Madam Speaker, this is why we need the Conscience Protection Act: for Foothill Church in Glendora; for Alpine Christian Fellowship in El Cajon; for the 12 New Jersey nurses who stood up to their employer for requiring them to train for and participate in abortion; and for Cathy DeCarlo, who deserves her day in court. This is why we need this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to this bill, which is really nothing more than a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is being touted as just simply a conscience clause, but, in fact, it strips away patient protections; it gives employers and healthcare companies the right to override a woman's reproductive healthcare decision; it vastly expands already damaging existing laws that restrict women's abilities to get full insurance coverage; and, just to add, it would clog the courts because it would create private rights of action for healthcare entities to enforce the law.

Now, existing so-called conscience provisions are bad enough, but what they apply to is existing healthcare entities. What this bill would do is something that has never been done before. It would allow employers and others to exercise this right; it would require OCR and DOJ to investigate claims of discrimination; and it would expand the definition of healthcare entities. All of this would just simply interfere with a woman's ability to get accurate information about treatment options and could lead to her being deprived of timely emergency care.

There is already plenty of evidence that current conscience provisions jeopardize women's health and safety. They create confusion about whether healthcare providers are required to offer critical care in emergency situations.

I have heard some heart-wrenching stories about what happened to the women. Let me just tell you one of them. Tamesha Means of Muskegon, Michigan, was only 18 weeks pregnant when her water broke. The nearest hospital, Mercy Health Partners, didn't pursue the normal course of treatment, inducing labor for a pregnancy that wasn't viable, in order to avoid risky complications. Instead, what they did is they gave her painkillers and they sent her home. Over the next 2 days, Tamesha returned to the hospital twice, bleeding and in severe pain, running a high fever, only to get more or less the same response. They were completing the papers to send her home a third time—a third time—when she started to deliver a very premature infant, dead within hours.

Madam Speaker, we would likely see much more needless suffering and endangerment if the bill before us were to pass. It would let employers who sponsor health plans deny their female employees access to medical services to which the employer objects. It would reinforce existing provisions that let health providers opt out of providing such services or even informing people about them.

With all of this in mind, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this bad legislation. Every patient should be able to make meaningful, informed decisions about their health care. Congress needs to stop interfering in women's health decisions once and for all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the Speaker of the House.

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I think we can all agree that in this country no one should be forced to perform an abortion.

Look, I know we disagree about when life begins; I know we disagree about what government should do about it; and, however strongly I hold my beliefs, I also know my friends on the other side of the issue feel just as strongly. I respect those disagreements. But whoever you are, whatever you believe, I think this is one thing that we all should agree on: no one should be forced to violate their conscience, least of all by the Federal Government. That is all this bill says.

The Federal Government, or anyone who receives taxpayer dollars, cannot discriminate against healthcare providers who do not perform abortions; and if they do discriminate, this bill says that the victims will have two avenues of relief: either file a complaint with the Department of Health and Human Services, or file a civil suit in court. That is it. That is what this bill does.

Now, opponents say that this kind of thing just doesn't ever happen, nobody in their right mind would force someone against their will to help with an abortion. Well, tell that to Cathy DeCarlo. She was a nurse at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York City. A few years ago, she was forced to help with an abortion.

Madam Speaker, this is not an isolated incident. There have been cases of nurses being suspended or threatened with firing solely for the offense of following their conscience.

And now the State of California requires all health insurance plans to cover abortion. So if you are a church or if you are a religious school, it doesn't matter, you must cover this procedure; and if it violates your conscience, too bad. This is a disturbing trend.

What is more disturbing is that the Federal Government has not been pro-

tecting people's rights. There are already laws on the books to protect people's conscience rights. But after Cathy DeCarlo filed a complaint to HHS, she waited 3 years for a resolution; and when she filed a lawsuit, an appeals court said she didn't even have standing and threw out her case.

That is why this bill makes it perfectly clear. People of faith have standing, and they deserve relief.

This bill does not ban or restrict abortion in any way. This bill does not change any medical standards or contracts. It does not change any laws regarding emergency treatment. All it does is protect a person's conscience.

Allowing this trend to continue, if we keep going down this path in this country, we will only erode our First Amendment rights further. It will continue to push people of faith into the sidelines of society. That is not the kind of country we want to live in, not any of us.

There is nothing more fulfilling than living out your faith, and we want all people of all faiths to live freely in our country. But we can live out our faith only if our government respects our faith. That is why we need to pass this bill.

I want to thank Congressman JOHN FLEMING and I want to thank Congresswoman DIANE BLACK for their outstanding work on this. JOHN and DIANE have done the Lord's work on defending people's conscience rights. It is the First Amendment of the Constitution, and it is under assault. This is something that keeps us free. This is something that makes us uniquely American. This is something that says men and women of conscience have rights that must be protected. And when our own government tramples upon and throws under the bus those rights, we have to act. That is why we are here today. They have been out front on this issue constantly leading this charge, and I am thankful for these warriors.

I have got to say to my colleagues, this is something that everyone should be in favor of, because if you believe in free speech, if you believe in freedom of religion, then you believe in freedom of conscience, then you believe in all of the First Amendment. That is why I ask each and every one of my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1500

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, let's talk about conscience and whose conscience should prevail in a decision about what a woman does with her body and who makes that decision.

Is it the conscience of an insurance company?

That is already in the law.

Is it the conscience of her boss who makes the decision?

Clearly, it is not the consciences of American women in this piece of legislation. The bottom line is it sounds to

me like it is the conscience of Republican politicians who want to tell the women of America what they can do with their bodies.

Let's be very clear. Right now, current law says that hospitals, insurers, and doctors may refuse to perform an abortion or to provide coverage for abortion, which already greatly limits women's access to legal procedures. This bill would further extend the dangerous law by allowing health plan sponsors—that means employers—to deny female employees access to legal medical services because the boss has a moral objection to it, not the woman who is making the most personal of decisions here.

Women and their doctors, not their bosses, should be making medical decisions, and no outsider should be able to decide something as important as the size or the timing of having a family; and a woman's access to reproductive health should not be dependent on where she works or on where she goes to school.

Even more importantly, when a woman's health is in danger, providers would not be required to act to protect the health of that mother. This bill would allow them—and this is in the new language—to refuse to facilitate or to make arrangements for an abortion if they have a moral objection to it. For example, a Catholic hospital could force a doctor to withhold information about a patient's medical condition or options if that information might facilitate a woman's obtaining an abortion. It could also refuse to provide transportation to another hospital for a woman who is in distress if that hospital provides abortions.

This takes away a woman's right of conscience, and we should be voting "no."

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank Congressman JOHN FLEMING, and I want to thank Congresswoman DIANE BLACK.

Before we come here as Members of Congress, we have occupations. JOHN FLEMING happens to be a doctor. DIANE BLACK started out as a nurse and is still a nurse. Her decades of experience, especially on this issue, are what have driven her in her work to make it here today.

Madam Speaker, I want to be explicitly clear so as to remove any confusion about what this legislation is and why we are voting on it today. This bill is not about abortion. Now, I am profoundly pro-life, and I don't hide it, but this bill isn't about that. It is about respecting people with different opinions and letting them live their lives without having the fear of punishment.

I am not asking people to change their closely held beliefs today. After all, every law on the books that has

governed abortion before this bill will remain exactly the same after this bill is passed. The message is more fundamental: don't force those who are deeply and morally opposed to something to fund it, support it, or perform it.

We all know America is unlike any other place. In America, we have Amish farmers, modern artists, stock market analysts, teachers, oil rig workers. We have the left and the right—Republican and Democrat—and every single one is just as American as the other. It is not easy to make this crazy experiment called "America" work, but we do because we respect that people may live in ways by which we don't approve and have opinions that we can't stand, and they are still our neighbors. This mutual respect is the lifeblood of a free society.

There are millions of people in this country—a majority, in fact—who are pro-life. That belief is intimately tied to our love of others and to our respect for human dignity; but many pro-life Americans face a choice no person should face.

Do they violate their consciences or violate the law? Do they do something they think is wrong, or do they lose their jobs?

A nurse in New York was told she had to participate in an abortion even though she objected. Her supervisor told her, if she didn't, she could be fired and could even lose her nursing license.

In my home State of California, a mandate forces pro-life individuals and churches to pay for insurance plans that cover the procedure even if doing so violates their deeply held beliefs. That mandate flies directly in the face of the Weldon amendment, which protects conscience rights—something of which this Congress has approved time and again for decades.

This mandate was challenged at the Department of Health and Human Services. It rejected the complaint. So I met with Secretary Burwell and with many of our colleagues to ask how this could happen.

How could a State force people to violate their beliefs?

I will tell you that I and the Members who were there still don't have an answer to our question.

But, Madam Speaker, why is this even a debate? Why would this administration want to force someone to violate his conscience?

As President Obama, himself, said early on in his Presidency, "Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion." I agree wholeheartedly with that statement.

Voting for this bill isn't voting against abortion. It is voting against compulsion. It is voting to reaffirm that mutual respect is necessary for a free society, and only with that respect can America live in the liberty we have so long enjoyed.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the

distinguished ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, when will the Republicans' war on women end?

First, Republicans passed a bill to allow a woman's boss to decide whether she has access to contraceptives. Next, Republicans passed legislation to prevent a woman from choosing the medical provider that best meets her needs. Today, Republicans are bringing another bill to the House floor to limit a woman's right to make the best decision for herself and her family.

This bill is not about protecting the conscience rights of healthcare entities to not provide or to participate in abortions. Providers already have those protections under current law. Instead, this bill expands and makes permanent policies that attempt to limit a woman's access to her constitutionally protected right to safe and legal abortions. This bill allows the moral beliefs of an employer's to limit a woman's access to healthcare services. A woman, not her employer, should make decisions about her health. Her healthcare choices are none of her boss's business.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for women's health by opposing this harmful legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), one of the authors of this legislation and the primary sponsor. I thank her for the excellent job that she does on all of the pro-life issues that affect not only our State, but our country.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee, my colleague and my friend.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of my bill, S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act of 2016.

This legislation would prevent governments from penalizing or in any way discriminating against a healthcare provider for its refusing to participate in an abortion. In doing so, it would codify an act, known as the Weldon amendment, which has been attached to the annual spending bill since 2004 with bipartisan support. Importantly, the bill would also take the law a step further in allowing for a civil right of action so that the victims of abortion discrimination would have their day in court.

Today, if you believe you have been discriminated against on the basis of refusing to be involved in an abortion, you appeal to the Obama administration's Department of Health and Human Services.

In the case of Cathy DeCarlo, a pro-life nurse from New York who was forced by her employer to assist in the abortion of a 22-week pre-born baby, it took HHS 3 years to close its investigation into her case.

In California, where the Department of Managed Health Care required all insurance plans in the State to offer the coverage of elective abortion, the HHS

took 2 years to determine that no violation of the law had occurred; this despite the fact that the churches and the Christian universities are now required to subsidize abortion through their insurance plans.

Congress must step in to clarify and to strengthen our laws so that the conscience rights of every American are protected, because, Madam Speaker, if we lose the right to live according to our own convictions, particularly on the matter as deeply affecting as abortion, we don't have much left, do we?

After all, it was Thomas Jefferson who reminded us: "No provision in our Constitution ought to be dearer to man than that which protects the rights of conscience against the enterprises of civil authority."

President Obama, himself, echoed this statement in 2009, saying, "Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion."

If my colleagues won't listen to the pleas of the pro-life Americans who are asking for the protection of these most basic rights, maybe they will listen to the words of their own President.

With this bill, I am not seeking to change anyone's mind on abortion; though I hope that one day I can. I am not asking my colleagues to rule anyone's abortion to be illegal; though every act of abortion absolutely breaks my heart. I am not asking my colleagues to withhold a dime from a single abortion provider; although I will continue to fight to stop the spending of my constituents' dollars to the industries that take human life.

Today I simply ask the Members of this body to allow the millions of Americans who believe as I do—in the sanctity of every human life—to abide by those beliefs without having them trampled upon by their own government. I urge a "yes" vote on this very compassionate, reasonable, and modest bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

Mrs. CAPPs. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Conscience Protection Act.

Despite its name, this bill actually does the opposite. It would infringe upon the beliefs and values of women across this country, putting their bosses' wishes over their own. This is wrong. It is yet another attempt to play politics with women's health. A woman's ability to control when, how, or whether to have children is central to her conscience, to her health, to her well-being, to her economic stability; but this bill would consider a woman's wish to be secondary to that of her employer's.

Let me be personal for just a moment. I am the daughter of a minister. I grew up in a parsonage, and my father was a member of the clergy. I understand the importance of religion to

the lives of so many, including to me. My faith was always a large part of what motivated me as a nurse, as a public health person, and what motivates me now as a Member of Congress. Perhaps it is because of this that I cannot stand on the sidelines when some are trying to use religion as a justification for discrimination or to take away the decisionmaking powers and responsibilities of another.

□ 1515

Health care and the personal decisions a woman makes are not her boss' business. It is far past time to get employers out of the exam room.

We need to trust and value women and let them make their own personal health decisions with their healthcare providers, with their family, with their faith, not politicians.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING), the author of this legislation and the primary co-sponsor.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the testimony from Honorable Dr. Dave Weldon, author of the Weldon amendment, on this very bill and a few letters I received from obstetricians and gynecologists from across the country.

STATEMENT BY THE HON. DAVE WELDON, MD,
RETIRED FL-15

CONGRESSIONAL FORUM ON CONSCIENCE RIGHTS,
JULY 8, 2016

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important issue. The stories shared today by the people around this table underscore the very reason I authored the Weldon amendment.

You can imagine my outrage to learn that this administration has gutted my amendment and is allowing ongoing discrimination in California.

Over a decade ago, I became aware of the Maryland NARAL Hospital Provider Project. This disturbing initiative was designed to force abortion into every hospital in Maryland.

In response to this and similar threats, I drafted my appropriations amendment. It is intended to bring a stop to the abortion industry crusade to force this gruesome procedure into every aspect of society.

Recognizing that the abortion lobby's relentless campaign knows no limits, we drafted the amendment to cover a wide universe of entities. Nurses, doctors, hospitals, even health plans themselves are covered entities under my amendment.

Covering individual health plans ensures that insurance companies that are ambivalent about abortion can still offer plans that exclude abortion to meet the needs of purchasers.

We never limited the protection to those with religious, moral or conscience objections. In fact, in my experience as a physician the majority of health professionals who claim to support Roe v Wade always say to me that they would never want to be affiliated with doing an abortion. They too would be protected if the administration would do their duty to enforce the law.

I authored this amendment to protect FREEDOM for people to provide health care free from abortion and FREEDOM for people to access health care and coverage free from the scourge of abortion.

FREEDOM for people like the pastors here today to purchase insurance plans that ex-

clude abortion—a freedom that existed just two years ago before California took the draconian step of mandating abortion in ALL plans under the authority of the California Department of Managed Health Care.

The origins of the directive are as insidious as the directive itself. When the abortion lobby found out that Catholic Universities in California did not cover abortion in their insurance plans, they sprang to action, initiating a meeting with the Department of Managed Health Care.

Less than a year later, the Department did the bidding of Planned Parenthood and the ACLU. They unilaterally inserted abortion into each and every insurance plan under their authority—even plans purchased by CHURCHES and Catholic Universities.

My amendment anticipated this very scenario by defining a health insurance plan as a protected health care entity. This allows an insurance company to offer multiple insurance plans—some with abortion coverage and some without to meet the conscience needs of their clients.

After the Department of Managed Health Care issued their directive, the plans excluding abortion were changed to include abortion. This is clear discrimination against the plan that excluded abortion, since such plan was no longer permitted to exist.

As I explained in my floor statement in 2004, "This is a continuation of the Hyde policy of conscience protection . . . The right of conscience is fundamental to our American freedoms. We should guarantee this freedom by protecting all health care providers from being forced to perform, refer or pay for elective abortions." Unfortunately, the current administration has even twisted this statement to suit their political agenda.

They take this reference to conscience protection and argue that it must mean that I meant to include a religious or moral test in my amendment. This is far from the truth.

There is no reasonable way to read my statement as an excuse to airdrop a religious or moral test into my amendment. The Hyde amendment stops ALL federal funding for elective abortion. Similarly, my amendment stops ALL discrimination against entities that do not provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortion.

Both amendments protect conscience broadly by protecting the freedom of Americans to offer and access health care that does not include abortion. Neither limits its protections to cases where someone raises a religious or moral objection.

In the June 21, 2016 letter announcing their gutting of the Weldon amendment, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) also feebly attempted to twist several more of my comments in their effort to ignore the plain reading of the text.

One begins to wonder, what's next. How far will the abortion lobby and their allies in the administration go to force abortion into our health care system?

I am deeply concerned that this administration added words to my amendment where they do not exist and ignored other words clearly articulated in the text.

We simply can no longer rely on the administration to enforce the law and must offer a private right of action that allows the Weldon protections to be enforced by the Courts.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER,
Charleston, WV, 12 July 16.

Representative JOHN FLEMING and Representative VICKY HARTZLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES FLEMING AND HARTZLER: I am writing in support of the

Conscience Protection Act, HR. 4828, that provides federal legal protection of conscience regarding abortion for those who care for pregnant women. My clinical experiences spans 25 plus years of clinical care, research, publication, and instruction as a Board certified Obstetrician & Gynecologist and Maternal-Fetal Medicine specialist. I daily provide care for women and babies who have medically complicated, life-threatening, and uncommon/rare pregnancy complications. Further, as the originator of "perinatal hospice", I have cared for (and still do) dozens of women with babies who have terminal prenatal diagnoses who will die at, or shortly after, birth.

No one in my entire 25 plus years of clinical experience has ever been denied appropriate care because of the exercise of the rights of conscience in the provision of abortion. Women and babies may die in spite of our best medical efforts, but this unrelated to abortion availability or provision.

In my understanding of this new federal statute, conscience will now be formally and legally protected. There is no need for additional exceptions, or amendments, to this law as it is presently written.

I am more than happy to discuss this issue with either of you or with one of your colleagues.

Sincerely,

BYRON C. CALHOUN, MD,
FACOG, FACS, FASAM,
MBA,
Professor & Vice-Chair, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, West Virginia University-Charleston, Charleston, WV.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, TWIN CITIES CAMPUS, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH,

July 6, 2016.

Representatives JOHN FLEMING, MD and VICKY HARTZLER,
House of Representatives, Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES FLEMING AND HARTZLER: I am a board certified specialist in Obstetrics/Gynecology and Maternal/Fetal Medicine with 36 years of experience in practice, teaching and research. During that time I have cared for hundreds of women and babies with life-threatening, complicated, and rare pregnancy conditions. In some of those situations mothers and babies have lost their lives despite undergoing the best available treatment including induced delivery at the margins of viability. I care deeply about the effects that public policy and legislation can have on the care of mothers and babies.

During my years of practice I have worked under informal and formal conscience rights protections that permit me to provide the best pregnancy care without being forced to perform abortions. I have read the Conscience Protection Act, H.R. 4828, and I agree with the federal formalization of these protections. In my years of practice I have never seen a woman denied appropriate care because of the exercise of rights of conscience in this regard. There is no need for additional exceptions or amendments to this law as it is written.

I am happy to discuss this with you or with your colleagues.

Sincerely,

STEVE CALVIN, MD
Clinical Associate Professor of Obstetrics/ Gynecology and Women's Health, Co-chair Program in

Human Rights and Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

ANTHONY P. LEVATINO, MD, JD,
Las Cruces, NM, July 7, 2016.

DEAR REPS. FLEMING AND HARTZLER: I understand you are seeking congressional approval of the Conscience Protection Act (H.R. 4828), to prevent government discrimination against health care providers who do not practice abortion. I am writing in support of your efforts. I am a board-certified obstetrician gynecologist. I received my medical degree from Albany Medical College in 1976 and completed my OB-GYN residency training at Albany Medical Center in 1980. In my 36-year career, I have been privileged to practice obstetrics and gynecology in both private and university settings, serving as associate professor of OB-GYN at Albany Medical College, medical student director, and residency program director. I currently serve as Clinical Professor and Chair of Obstetrics & Gynecology at the Burrell College of Osteopathic Medicine. I have also dedicated many years to private practice and currently operate a solo gynecology practice in Las Cruces, NM. I would like to comment on the claim that government must require involvement in abortion in order to save women's lives, because of life threatening conditions that can and do arise in pregnancy. I can speak to this issue from experience. I no longer perform abortions, but during my first five years of private practice I performed approximately 1,200 abortions including over 100 second trimester Suction D&E procedures up to 24 weeks gestation.

At Albany Medical Center in the 1990s, I personally treated hundreds of women with life threatening conditions that can arise or worsen during the second and third trimester of pregnancy. In all of those cases, "terminating" the pregnancy—that is, delivering the child—can be life saving. In all such cases I treated, abortion was never a viable treatment option. By their nature, late-term abortion procedures require days of preparation of the cervix in order to be successful. Any attempt to perform an abortion in such cases—that is, to take the extra steps needed to ensure that the unborn child does not survive—entails undue and dangerous delay in providing appropriate, truly life-saving care for women.

As an illustration, a patient arrived at Albany Medical Center one night at 28 weeks gestation with severe pre-eclampsia or toxemia. Her blood pressure on admission was 220/160 and was so dangerously high that she was likely minutes or hours away from a major stroke. This case was managed successfully by rapidly stabilizing the patient's blood pressure, then "terminating" her pregnancy by Cesarean section. She and her baby did well. This is a typical case in the world of high-risk obstetrics. During my time at Albany Medical Center I managed hundreds of such cases by "terminating" pregnancies to save mother's lives. In all those hundreds of cases, the number of unborn children that I had to deliberately kill was zero.

Attempting to treat women with truly life-threatening conditions in the late 2nd and 3rd trimester with an abortion entails serious delay of care that is not appropriate in the vast majority of cases. I welcome your efforts to ensure that health professionals can provide optimal medical care for preg-

nant women, without having to fear outside legal pressure to perform abortions instead.

Very truly yours,

ANTHONY LEVATINO, MD, JD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,

Chapel Hill, NC, July 13, 2016.

Rep. JOHN FLEMING,
Rep. VICKY HARTZLER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES FLEMING AND HARTZLER: I am a board certified specialist in Obstetrics and Gynecology with a sub-specialty certification in Maternal-Fetal Medicine. I have over thirty-two years of experience in practice, teaching and research at a major academic health center. During my career I have cared for numerous women and babies with complications that increase the risk of maternal death. In some of these situations, both a mother and her baby have lost their lives. I care deeply about the effects that public policy and legislation can have on both those of us who provide perinatal care and on our patients.

My personal conscience directs me to provide the best of care to pregnant women and their unborn children and I am able to do so without performing abortions, as are several of my colleagues and a proportion of the residents we train each year. I have not seen a situation where an emergent or even urgent abortion was needed to prevent a maternal death. I am aware of, and have read, the Conscience Protection Act, and I am writing to provide my opinion that I support the formalization of these protections. No woman at UNC hospitals has ever been denied care due to her conscience or beliefs; nor does any physician ever feel obliged to direct or change the standard of care for any woman due to race, ethnicity, religion, or conscience. I see no need for any exceptions or amendments to the law as written.

I am available for question or comment or for further discussion on this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN THORP, MD,
Hugh McAllister Distinguished Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Professor, Maternal & Child Health, School of Public Health, Director, Women's Primary Healthcare.

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, those words are inscribed in the Declaration of Independence among our inalienable rights, but the most important is life itself.

As a physician who has delivered hundreds of babies, a father of four and a grandfather of three, I think I know something about preborn life and about the beginning of life itself.

This is much more important than just our day-to-day work that we do here. So a decision in order for a healthcare worker or nonhealthcare worker to participate with an abortion, whether paying for it or actually performing it, is an immensely important debate that we should have here.

It is not just religious grounds, as what is suggested on the other side, but also moral grounds. You see, even an atheist can find it against his or her conscience to participate in any way with an abortion.

Now, the Conscience Protection Act, what is it, and why do we need it? Well, I would say, first of all, that it gives a private right of action to any American who disagrees with being required to pay insurance that would cover elective abortions. Certainly, a healthcare provider that may have to participate in any way—a physician, a nurse, anyone—should not be required to do that against his or her will. And it protects for that. It gives a private right of action.

Now, why do we need a private right of action? Because in the recent example, in California, Secretary Burwell has failed, has deliberately avoided enforcing the very law itself, the Weldon amendment, that has been in law for 12 years. She has failed to enforce that law. And, therefore, the people of California, millions of people, do not have an access to court. They can't complain. They can't do anything and get relief.

What this bill does is allow them to open that courtroom door and to get that relief and not be required any longer to participate with abortions, spending or otherwise.

Now, the other side might say: What is the need for this? Is anyone being harmed?

Of course, they are. You have heard of the DeCarlo case, where the nurse had to participate with putting dismembered body parts back together of a 22-week-old fetus. We have the nurses of Nassau University Medical Center. In 2010, nine of them were suspended for refusing to assist in abortions. And we have many, many other cases.

I would just say to you, in conclusion today, this is the land of the free. This is, again, life and the pursuit of happiness. Certainly, it is important that what we do here today, in passing this bill, that we protect the conscience rights—not just the religious rights but the moral rights—of our fellow citizens of America. We do the right thing, and we go on, and we work from there.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 304 because this Republican bill discriminates against women. In fact, it promotes discrimination by sanctioning interference with a woman's ability to make her own personal health decisions.

This bill, which was brought to the floor without any hearing in the Congress, is being done as the Republicans rush for the exits for summer recess tomorrow. It highlights the unfortunate inability of the Republican majority to focus on the issues that are affecting American families, like things to keep us safe, like keeping military-style weapons out of the hands of terrorists or dangerous people. They won't allow a debate or vote on that. Addressing the Flint, Michigan, water crisis, we haven't had a vote, a debate, or help for those families.

The emerging public health crisis of Zika. In my home State of Florida, we now are approaching 300 cases of Zika, including 43 pregnant women. What we know is birth defects and microcephaly are directly tied to the Zika virus. I hope that will weigh on everyone's conscience as the Republicans move toward adjournment without taking any action on the Zika virus.

There was a report yesterday:

Infectious-disease experts are shocked that Congress is about to leave town for the summer without doing anything to combat the Zika virus.

"In the almost 40 years I've been in this business, I've never seen anything like what's happening with Zika," said an adviser to four administrations.

Some infectious-disease experts said they're stunned by what's happened with Zika—months of waiting while the virus' reach, and its potential to cause widespread birth defects, in the U.S. has grown.

So, colleagues, I urge you to defeat this discriminatory bill and get back to the business of the American people, keeping them safe, like addressing the Zika virus, not attacking the constitutional rights of women and their ability to make their own healthcare decisions.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER). I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on life issues in this body.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in firm support of the Conscience Protection Act. The validity and timeliness of this legislation could not be more important in light of recent events in California in which religious employers are being forced to violate their beliefs by purchasing health coverage for their employees that includes elective abortion. And as stories surface, such as those you have heard about today of nurses being forced to participate in abortion procedures or else risk losing their job, the time to correct this injustice is now.

It is unthinkable that the government could and would force a person to act against their personally held beliefs, yet that is what is happening. In a speech in Notre Dame, in 2009, President Obama said: "Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion." But those words have rung hollow as his administration has sided with those who violate the First Amendment. It doesn't have to be like this.

The Conscience Protection Act addresses this discrimination. It gives legal protection to those who choose not to participate in abortions and upholds our most fundamental rights. There is no more noble goal.

The government should not be picking and choosing our beliefs. Those who have had this happen to them deserve their day in court. This bill will give them that day.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Conscience Protection Act and against coerced complicity in abortion.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished

gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for being such a strong voice on women's rights in this country.

Colleagues, yesterday, this body considered a bill that would codify discrimination against our Nation's LGBT community under the guise of religious freedom. Today, we are debating legislation that would similarly distort this country's sacred promise of religious liberty and use it as a vehicle to deny women access to health care.

Make no mistake, the ability to freely and fully practice your faith is a fundamental bedrock American liberty. But to ensure that liberty for all of us, our Constitution establishes a simple boundary. One person's sincerely held beliefs cannot trump another's. My freedoms and rights cannot be used to limit yours.

And in this country, access to abortion is a right, as our Justices have ruled time and again.

So let's be clear. This bill is not about protecting religious freedom of an employer or insurer. It is about imposing the religious views of a few on the healthcare choices of the many.

And this bill is not about protecting women's health. Instead, it will create dangerous, discriminatory barriers to access to care for women and their families.

Those who oppose abortion are free to exercise that belief fully in their personal lives. That is the promise that our country makes to each of us. But nowhere does this country promise that your government will be the vehicle through which your beliefs are imposed on someone else—your neighbor, your coworker, your employer, or your friend. Nowhere do we say that my faith is more legitimate than yours or that your religious principles outweigh my access to basic civil rights.

In fact, the Constitution expressly prohibits that sort of system in the very first words of the very First Amendment. Since those words were written, the ever-changing, often elusive balance between religious freedom and civil rights in this country has been fought for every single day throughout our history.

Passing this bill is an affront to those honest efforts and to the vast majority of Americans who value both their faith and their freedoms.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, we have all used this expression: "I can't do that in good conscience." But we really don't think deeply about what it means. So let me take a moment from the debate here and explore that question deeper.

Conscience is the sacred space of human dignity. Conscience is the place where, one, a person using the faculty of reason exercises their deeply held sincere beliefs to make a judgment in a

particular circumstance about what is right or wrong, what they ought to do or not to do.

When the government comes along and robs us of our right to exercise our conscience, the government contradicts the very principle of its existence, of its purpose. The government imposes a dictate and violates that sacred space, the good of the human person, and the good of community. That is unjust. That is not America. That is an exercise in power. That is an imposition of the few with power on the many who deserve protection from their government.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the so-called Conscience Protection Act. I proudly represent the 11th District of Illinois. And as someone who supports a woman's right to choose, I find it deeply disturbing that so many lawmakers today want to make healthcare access more difficult for women.

This legislation will be detrimental to women's health because it gives individuals and corporations a license to discriminate against women's reproductive choices.

I am also the only Ph.D. scientist in Congress. And as a scientist, I find it outrageous that this bill will give healthcare companies the right to deny accurate medical information to patients. This kind of legislation deliberately undercuts a woman's relationship to her doctor and has no place in the laws of our country.

It is designed to confuse and to muddle the responsibilities of the medical community, who have been trained to make the best possible decisions for the patients in their trust. It, therefore, prioritizes ideology above science and reason to the detriment of women throughout the country.

Every woman has the legal and constitutional right to make the healthcare decisions that are right for her and to receive scientifically correct advice from her healthcare providers.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this unnecessary and dangerous legislation.

□ 1530

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding and for her leadership not only on this bill, but especially for her work as chair of the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives.

When we talk about this legislation, the Conscience Protection Act, I do want to also thank the author of the bill, DIANE BLACK, as well as Dr. JOHN FLEMING, who helped lead this effort to draft it, Chairman JOE PITTS, and CHRIS SMITH as well.

Madam Speaker, it is so important that we pass the Conscience Protection Act. If you look at our Bill of Rights, our Constitution, and the framework that gives people all across this country true religious freedom, we recognize now that religious freedom is under attack. You don't need to look any further than the State of California which passed a law that really was the genesis for bringing this bill forward, because under the California law, it literally started forcing people to perform abortions against their own faith.

We have heard about the story of Cathy DeCarlo, a nurse who was forced to participate in an abortion of a baby who was 22 weeks old at delivery. This should not happen in the United States of America. People should not be forced to violate their religious freedom, yet it is going on because this administration has not been enforcing the law. The Weldon amendment, which has been on the books since 2004, gives that very religious freedom protection that is now in jeopardy.

Madam Speaker, what we are doing with this bill is restoring the law, but we are doing two specific things:

First, we are making it very clear that this annual appropriations language becomes permanent. We shouldn't have to rely every year on re-establishing the law. Let's make this law permanent giving that religious freedom protection.

Second, we are no longer depending on HHS alone, which is not doing its job to enforce the law. We actually give people the ability to enforce the law themselves and let government work for them in protecting their religious freedoms.

It is critically important that we pass the Conscience Protection Act. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this bill and in so many other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Conscience Protection Act. It is, in fact, a bill that offends the conscience and threatens the health and security of women. This vindictive bill is yet another tactic to throw roadblocks between women and their constitutional right to choose their own form of reproductive health care.

Neither an employer nor an insurance company has the right to dictate a woman's healthcare choices. That is right. This bill permits insurance companies to deny certain coverage based on religious or moral grounds. This is merely another deliberate attempt to cut women off from safe, legal, comprehensive healthcare services. It could even restrict medical communication between a patient and her doctor or prevent women from getting critical emergency care.

There are already sufficient laws in place so that religious institutions and providers cannot be compelled to perform abortions if they are morally opposed. So who are we protecting?

This bill is not about conscience. It is an attack. It is an attack on women. It is an attack on their health care. It is a vehicle of discrimination against women, and women only. I urge my colleagues to vote against this unnecessary and destructive bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS). He is the chairman of our Health Subcommittee and one of the life leaders, chairman of the Values Action Team here in Congress. He is retiring this year, and we are going to miss his leadership on all the life issues.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill before us today. It is an urgent and necessary legislative fix. The Conscience Protection Act would simply make the protections of the Weldon conscience amendment more effective and permanent. The Weldon amendment has been the law of the land and approved by Congress as part of the appropriations process every year since 2004.

Sadly, just 3 weeks ago, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office for Civil Rights ruled that the California Department of Managed Health Care did not violate the Weldon amendment when it unilaterally required abortion in all health insurance plans. Due to this governmental discrimination against plans that previously excluded abortion, conscientious objectors are being forced to cover abortion through their health plans against the dictates of their conscience.

This bill protects those who do not wish to participate in, provide for, or pay for abortions by opting out. It is this right to decline involvement in abortion that requires these protections, and the protections simply allow an aggrieved party to seek judicial review through a civil right of action.

I urge support of the bill.

ENERGY AND COMMERCE CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT FORUM TESTIMONIES PART II, STATEMENT BY THE HON. DAVE WELDON MD RETIRED FL-15, CONGRESSIONAL FORUM ON CONSCIENCE RIGHTS JULY 8, 2016

Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important issue. The stories shared today by the people around this table underscore the very reason I authored the Weldon amendment.

You can imagine my outrage to learn that this administration has gutted my amendment and is allowing ongoing discrimination in California.

Over a decade ago, I became aware of the Maryland NARAL Hospital Provider Project. This disturbing initiative was designed to force abortion into every hospital in Maryland.

In response to this and similar threats, I drafted my appropriations amendment. It is intended to bring a stop to the abortion industry crusade to force this gruesome procedure into every aspect of society.

Recognizing that the abortion lobby's relentless campaign knows no limits, we drafted the amendment to cover a wide universe

of entities. Nurses, doctors, hospitals, even health plans themselves are covered entities under my amendment. Covering individual health plans ensures that insurance companies that are ambivalent about abortion can still offer plans that exclude abortion to meet the needs of purchasers.

We never limited the protection to those with religious, moral or conscience objections. In fact, in my experience as a physician the majority of health professionals who claim to support Roe v Wade always say to me that they would never want to be affiliated with doing an abortion. They too would be protected if the administration would do their duty to enforce the law.

I authored this amendment to protect FREEDOM for people to provide health care free from abortion and FREEDOM for people to access health care and coverage free from the scourge of abortion.

FREEDOM for people like the pastors here today to purchase insurance plans that exclude abortion—a freedom the existed just two years ago before California took the draconian step of mandating abortion in ALL plans under the authority of the California Department of Managed Health Care.

The origins of the directive are as insidious as the directive itself. When the abortion lobby found out that Catholic Universities in California did not cover abortion in their insurance plans, they sprang to action, initiating a meeting with the Department of Managed Health Care.

Less than a year later, the Department did the bidding of Planned Parenthood and the ACLU. They unilaterally inserted abortion into each and every insurance plan under their authority—even plans purchased by CHURCHES and Catholic Universities.

My amendment anticipated this very scenario by defining a health insurance plan as a protected health care entity. This allows an insurance company to offer multiple insurance plans—some with abortion coverage and some without to meet the conscience needs of their clients.

After the Department of Managed Health Care issued their directive, the plans excluding abortion were changed to include abortion. This is clear discrimination against the plan that excluded abortion, since such plan was no longer permitted to exist.

As I explained in my floor statement in 2004, “This is a continuation of the Hyde policy of conscience protection. . . . The right of conscience is fundamental to our American freedoms. We should guarantee this freedom by protecting all health care providers from being forced to perform, refer or pay for elective abortions.” Unfortunately, the current administration has even twisted this statement to suit their political agenda.

They take this reference to conscience protection and argue that it must mean that I meant to include a religious or moral test in my amendment. This is far from the truth.

There is no reasonable way to read my statement as an excuse to airdrop a religious or moral test into my amendment. The Hyde amendment stops ALL federal funding for elective abortion. Similarly, my amendment stops ALL discrimination against entities that do not provide, pay for, provide coverage of, or refer for abortion.

Both amendments protect conscience broadly by protecting the freedom of Americans to offer and access health care that does not include abortion. Neither limits it's protections to cases where someone raises a religious or moral objection.

In the June 21, 2016 letter announcing their gutting of the Weldon amendment, the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) also feebly attempted to twist several more of my comments in their effort to ignore the plain reading of the text.

One begins to wonder, what's next. How far will the abortion lobby and their allies in the administration go to force abortion into our health care system?

I am deeply concerned that this administration added words to my amendment where they do not exist and ignored other words clearly articulated in the text.

We simply can no longer rely on the administration to enforce the law and must offer a private right of action that allows the Weldon protections to be enforced by the Courts.

TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL CASEY MATTOX, SENIOR COUNSEL, ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM, CONGRESSIONAL FORUM ON CONSCIENCE RIGHTS—JULY 8, 2016

My name is Casey Mattox, Senior Counsel for Alliance Defending Freedom. As you have heard from those who preceded me, all of whom ADF has been privileged to represent now or in the recent past, rights of conscience in the medical professions are under attack. Regrettably, some would make conscience a partisan issue. But historically it has not been so.

In Roe itself the Supreme Court acknowledged the importance of protecting conscience even as it created an abortion right, noting that the AMA recognized that medical professionals should never be “required to perform any act violative of personally held moral principles.” Few disagreed.

When the House considered the Church Amendments just weeks after Roe, which were intended in part to stop the ACLU's lawsuits to force Catholic hospitals to perform abortions or stop serving Medicaid patients, the bill passed 372-1 in the House and 92-1 in the Senate. I challenge any of you to imagine such a vote on anything today. Senator Ted Kennedy defended the bill's “full protection to the religious freedom of physicians and others.”

As other issues arose, this bipartisan agreement to protect conscience remained, resulting in additional laws like the Coats-Snowe Amendment and later, the Weldon Amendment. As recently as 1992, when testifying in support of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, ACLU President Nadine Strossen explained the law would safeguard “such familiar practices as . . . permitting religiously sponsored hospitals to decline to provide abortion or contraception services.”

Sadly, conscience is no longer a consensus. When virtually everyone agreed that we were all better off with doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and religious hospitals serving the public while maintaining their moral principles, existing healthcare conscience laws may have been sufficient.

But today . . .

The ACLU has relaunched its decades-old assault on Catholic hospitals and aid agencies with a new campaign to force them to perform abortions or withdraw from serving the poor.

Individual medical professionals face increasing pressures and orders to perform abortions or lose their jobs.

Washington state enacted a law at Planned Parenthood's request designed to punish pharmacists who refused to violate their consciences.

After years of failed attempts to enact abortion mandates through favorable legislatures, the abortion lobby has now found unelected allies to impose these mandates bureaucratically—with even churches forced to cover abortions from the offering plate.

And as the Administration refuses to enforce the existing conscience laws, medical students must decide whether to pursue careers in women's health knowing that they may no longer be able to depend on these bi-

partisan laws to protect them when they need it.

Whatever one's abortion views, Americans should be able to agree—as even the most ardent abortion supporters in Congress and culture historically have—that the “choice” should not involve government compulsion.

In light of the Administration's failure to act, it is clear that we need a right of action to make these protections meaningful again. We need the Conscience Protection Act.

RICHARD M. DOERFLINGER, REMARKS AT A FORUM ON THE CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT (HR 4828), HOUSE ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE JULY 8, 2016

It is clear why conscience rights on abortion should be important to Congress. Our Declaration of Independence, which we celebrate this week, cites the unalienable rights that governments must respect because they are bestowed by our Creator. Those rights begin with life and liberty. If government can take away our liberty to respect life, there is no right it cannot take away. Congress and the states have passed laws to protect conscience rights since the Supreme Court legalized abortion in 1973. And until very recently, in this Administration, support for such laws has been strong and thoroughly bipartisan.

The first such federal law is the Church amendment of 1973—named for its prime sponsor, Democratic Senator Frank Church of Idaho. It was needed for two reasons. First, after Roe v. Wade, abortion supporters claimed that medical students, health professionals and hospitals legally must perform abortions; second, a federal court had ruled that even a Catholic hospital must do sterilizations if it receives federal funds. The Church amendment protected moral and religious objections to these procedures, and in some circumstances to any procedure. In 1996 Congress acted again, because a national accrediting body was trying to force all ob/gyn residency programs to provide abortion training. The Coats/Snowe amendment said the government would not discriminate against residents and residency programs that do not perform abortions as regards accreditation and federal aid. It passed the Senate 63-37, supported by Democrats such as Patrick Leahy and Joseph Biden, and remains law today (42 USC 238n). It is not limited to objections based on morality or religion, for reasons I would be happy to discuss. In 2002 the Abortion Non-Discrimination Act sought to ensure that this policy would apply in non-training contexts. It passed the House 229-189, supported by 37 Democrats, but was not taken up by the Senate. Its policy was finally written into law in 2004 through the Labor/HHS appropriations rider known as the Weldon amendment.

We now know these laws have a serious deficiency: None of them includes a private right of action, allowing victims of discrimination to go to court. All enforcement has been by the HHS Office for Civil Rights. This deficiency is now fatal, since this Administration refuses to enforce the law as written and is itself a perpetrator of discrimination, as in the domestic program for victims of human trafficking.

Pro-abortion forces are now exploiting what they claim are additional ambiguities in the Weldon amendment. They even think they can have it declared unconstitutional because of its enforcement mechanism, and the Obama administration now gives credence to that claim. To defend pro-life Americans' fundamental rights we need a clear definition of who is protected, and a method of enforcement that is legally secure and workable. This would be provided by the Conscience Protection Act, HR 4828.

JIM GARLOW TESTIMONY

My name is Jim Garlow. I am the pastor of Skyline church in San Diego. I want to tell you a story.

Lynda grew up in the Midwest. As a 14 year old high school freshman, she was flattered that two high school seniors wanted to take her to a movie. However, instead of going to a movie, they drove the truck into a field in the darkness of night and there they raped her.

She became pregnant. Several months along, her pregnancy was confirmed by a doctor and the decision was made to place the baby for adoption.

Lynda's pregnancy was problematic. The closest hospital that could assist such a complicated pregnancy was 60 miles away. Her mother—holding down a job and raising other children, including two infants—could not come to see her. For several months, the 14 years old lay flat on her back. By herself. In a large city a long way from her small town.

Finally the baby was born—a girl. A couple adopted her. My (late) wife and I were that couple. We named that baby girl Janie.

Thirty six years later, my wife Carol died of cancer. Shortly thereafter my daughter Janie happened to make connection with her birthmother. It was then we found out that Janie was not merely the product of rape—but of a gang rape.

This birthmother—who is now in her 50's—is a hero to me. Why? Because we believe that while there might be unwanted pregnancies, the results of those pregnancies are always wanted babies.

I have not only adopted four babies, but I have worked to help couples adopt babies. And two of my daughters have adopted babies—including our daughter Janie.

The thought of a baby being killed in the womb is a detestable and despicable act.

In the last two years I have remarried. I married Rosemary Schindler, who by her first marriage is distantly related to Oskar Schindler of Schindler's List fame. My wife—following in the gifting of Oskar Schindler—has given her life to work with holocaust survivors—including 57 trips to Israel.

And . . . I have given people tours to Germany—including a stop by Buchenwald, the concentration camp. America's killing centers will someday be likened to these locations of death.

I find it appalling beyond words that my church . . . my church! . . . is being forced so pay for such despicable acts. I plead with you to do all you can to "let my people go" from this horrific Dept of Managed Healthcare "Pharaoh."

Thank you so much

JIM GARLOW

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The gentlewoman from Colorado has 15 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to another bill that is aimed to come between a woman and her doctor. I have heard a lot of people talk about laws in California and so forth and what we are doing.

This is my license to practice medicine in California as a doctor. Core to the oath I took as a doctor were three

things: to do good, to do no harm, and the third plank in the ethics that guide how we practice is patient autonomy. That is what I want to talk about today, because what is buried in our Constitution is individual rights, individual liberties, and there is no right more sacred than what we do with our own bodies.

Now, my job as a doctor is to sit in that exam room, answer the questions, and empower my patients to make the decisions that best impact their lives. That is why I find the Conscience Protection Act so objectionable, because it takes away a patient's right to make the decisions about their own health care. Let me give you an example that actually happened in our State.

In northern California earlier this year, a woman was going to have a baby. She wanted to have that baby. She was scheduled to have a C-section, but she already had prior kids, and she wanted to get a tubal ligation after the C-section. Her doctor thought that was the most prudent thing to do. That is totally acceptable. That is standard medical care. The problem was her hospital said she couldn't do it because they conscientiously objected to it.

Now, to me that isn't a healthcare provider making a decision. That isn't taking best medical practice and making a decision. There wasn't anything objectionable about that. That is why we need to get the government out of our healthcare system. We need to get politicians out of the exam room. We need to make these decisions about that sacred bond between a patient and their physician, because she needs to make the decision.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, this is about honoring that sacred oath between a patient and their physician.

Let's protect patients' rights, let's make our patients and women able to make the decisions that best impact their lives, and that is what this is about—individual liberties and individual rights.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conscience Protection Act. This legislation helps us protect our Nation's most vulnerable and protects healthcare providers' right of choice. The Conscience Protection Act will enable healthcare providers, charities, small businesses, and churches to have the power to make decisions regarding their practices.

Our government should not force these entities to participate in or perform abortions against their deeply moral, ethical, or religious beliefs. No American should be forced to act against their beliefs. I am proud this bill provides protection to those who do not wish to be a part of these practices.

I thank my colleagues on the Committee on Energy and Commerce for their work on this very important bill.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me, and I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Republicans have a hard time winning, especially on abortion. Already there are no Federal funds for abortion except rape, incest, or life of the mother. Already religious objections must be accommodated. But this bill allows the employer to veto his employee's reproductive health choices. How un-American.

Let's thank the Supreme Court of the United States that, in an unusual move, has just sent a case back to the Justice Department for an appropriate compromise after nuns did not want to fill out a form absolving them of making a decision on abortion for their employees. The Court said, you can find an answer without depriving these employees of their healthcare choices.

Some Republicans won't be satisfied until abortion is unavailable nationwide, as Congress has done, to its shame, for poor women in the District of Columbia, whose local tax funds cannot be used for abortion services. This choice belongs to women and to women alone.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD statements from the Protection Act Forum in addition to the statements previously included by Mr. PITTS.

ENERGY AND COMMERCE CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT FORUM TESTIMONIES PART I, JULY 8TH FORUM ON CAPITOL HILL

Good morning. My name is Dr. Marie-Alberte Boursiquot and I am the president-elect of the Catholic Medical Association. I am delighted and honored to be invited to address you ladies and gentlemen today on the Conscience Protection Act (CPA).

It's providential that we are gathered today to discuss a threat to our religious liberties following the July 4th holiday. I need not remind any of you that our First Amendment states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..."

I am here today to help you appreciate the importance of upholding conscience rights and religious liberty in all aspects of life and most especially in the delivery of health care.

As an organization, the CMA was accepted as a party to the case of the ACLU vs. Trinity Health Care where the ACLU would force hospitals to perform abortions and threaten the rights of medical professionals and the choices of pro-life patients. This case would furthermore violate federal conscience laws.

The Conscience Protection Act of 2016 is necessary in that it will protect health care professionals from being forced to pay for or participate in abortions and allow victims of discrimination a "right of action" to defend their rights in court.

We cannot allow our government to force hospitals, physicians, nurses, and other health care professionals to stop offering much needed health care because they cannot in good conscience participate in destroying developing life.

This intrusion of the government prohibits the free exercise of our faith as Catholics. Catholic Medical students are particularly vulnerable in that they may be forced to participate in abortions and learn how to perform them. This would not only violate their conscience, as Catholics, but force them to violate the Hippocratic Oath.

This oath, as you know, was developed in the 5th–3rd century, B.C and requires a new physician to swear to uphold specific ethical standards in the practice of medicine. A modernized version of the original Greek version is often used today. But originally one swore to the following:

Respect the authority of our teachers

To treat the sick according to one's ability and judgment but never with a view to injure and wrongdoing

Never to administer poison to anyone who'd ask for it nor to suggest such a course

Not to give to a woman a pessary to cause abortion

To keep pure and holy both our lives and our art

Help the sick and abstain from all intentional wrong doing and harm

Respect the confidentiality of our discussion with our patients

All human life is a gift from God. Pregnancy is not an ailment but a sign of health. Abortion terminates that gift of life and the woman ultimately suffers physically, spiritually, and emotionally. Physicians and Catholic hospitals should not be coerced to violate their consciences in performing this harmful act nor allow it to be performed in a Catholic setting.

Respectfully,

MARIE-ALBERTE
BOURSIQUOT, M.D.,
F.A.C.P., *President-
elect, Catholic Medical
Association.*

FOOTHILL CHURCH, TESTIMONY BEFORE
CONGRESSIONAL FORUM

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Chris Lewis and I'm the Lead Pastor at Foothill Church in Glendora, California.

Foothill Church has approximately 1,000 people who attend each weekend. We are actively involved in serving our local community by helping low income public schools, raising money for victims of sex trafficking and serving in a local crisis pregnancy center. We've never waived in our Biblical conviction about the sanctity of all life and that life begins at the moment of conception and must be protected.

In May of 2014, Foothill Church, on its own initiative, asked its insurance broker to begin working with our insurance providers (Kaiser & Blue Shield) specifically to ensure that we were not covering abortions or abortifacient drugs. Our sole purpose for doing that was to ensure that we were not contradicting our deeply held beliefs about the sanctity of Life by offering insurance that, in practice, denied those beliefs. Our church's employees don't want abortion coverage and our church members don't wish their tithes and offerings contributing to abortion coverage.

In the Summer of 2014, we were pleased to find out that Kaiser Permanente had already been approved to offer such a plan by DMHC in 2012. Our insurers were willing and able to provide us with an insurance plan that met the needs of our employees and which was consistent with our religious convictions. This should have been the end of the story.

But on August 22nd, 2014, the DMHC issued an order requiring every medical plan in the state to "provide coverage of ALL terminations of pregnancies effective immediately." There is no religious exception.

Today, because of the decision by the DHMC and the refusal of HHS to require them to follow federal law and grant religious exemptions, Foothill Church is being coerced by the State, to violate one of our most cherished beliefs and deeply held religious convictions and offer abortions in our medical plan. Jesus taught us to render to Caesar that which is Caesar's, but neither human life, nor our consciences belong to Caesar, they belong to God. The tithes and offerings of the people of Foothill Church do not belong to Caesar, they belong to God. And when Caesar and God disagree we have no choice: we must render to God what is God's.

This illegal mandate places Foothill Church in an impossible situation. On the one hand, we have a Biblical (and now under Obamacare a legal) obligation to take care of our employees. And we want to do that. But on the other hand, California says that in fulfilling that obligation, we must cover abortions and violate one of our fundamental beliefs. If we don't, we will face penalties of thousands per employee. We have explored alternatives, but as a single church we simply can't take on the cost and risk of self-insuring our employees and their families.

So here we are, left in a precarious position first by the State and now by the Administration which has refused to enforce the law that should protect us.

I want to thank you for taking time to hear me today and I'm asking you to act.

TESTIMONY OF FE VINOYA, JULY 8, 2016

My name is Fe Esperanza Racpan Vinoya, a nurse of 26 years and I represent the 12 nurses who were ordered to assist in abortion 6 years ago in a Same Day Surgery Unit in New Jersey. I became a nurse to help people, not to do harm. Participating in the destruction of human life is not only a violation of my religious convictions, it conflicts with my calling as a medical professional to protect life, not to end it.

Despite our numerous pleas to our superiors due to our religious beliefs, we were required to be trained to participate in the preparation, delivery, and disposal of the baby. Our jobs were threatened if we were not to follow their directives.

Protecting our conscience serves our patients well. I will not participate in abortion. Period. So no amount of compulsion against me would have succeeded. But forcing me and my colleagues out of our jobs would have denied all of my patients access to the services we perform on a daily basis. And no one should want medical professionals, with the power of life and death in their hands, that are forced to set aside their moral convictions.

Both New Jersey and federal law prohibited discrimination against us because of our refusal to perform abortions. But in practice those laws are often only as effective as the willingness of government to respect them. In response to our lawsuit to defend our rights the hospital argued that those laws gave us no right to sue and enforce those laws. That I and my colleagues had to go through this ordeal shows the need for clearer protections that do not rely upon the good faith of government officials.

I am here in your presence right now as the voice for the health professionals who are and will be undergoing the same traumatic experience of being ordered to participate in the killing of the innocent babies. I was asked to choose between following my conscience or keeping my job to sustain my family. We were blessed to have the assistance of ADF and attorney Demetrios Stratis to protect our rights. Others will not be so fortunate, and should not have to rely sim-

ply upon the hope that whichever Administration is in power will enforce the law.

I encourage you to protect medical professionals like us and allow us to serve our patients without fear of discrimination. Please pass the Conscience Protection Act.

REMARKS BY ALLIANCE FOR CONSCIENCE RIGHTS DIRECTOR WILLIAM J. COX, ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE FORUM ON CONSCIENCE RIGHTS, JULY 8, 2016

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Bill Cox, and I am here in two capacities: as the director of the Alliance for Conscience Rights, a national coalition of Catholic health care systems formed to address growing governmental discrimination against faith-based health care providers; and as CEO of the Sacramento-based Alliance of Catholic Health Care, which represents California's 48 Catholic hospitals.

The nub of this morning's conversation is about whether federal civil rights statutes, such as the Weldon Amendment, should include a private right of action. This would give the victims of private and governmental discrimination standing to adjudicate their claims in federal court.

I'll briefly make four points: First, every federal civil rights law includes a private right of action, including the Administration's new health care non-discrimination rule. The Weldon civil rights statute should include one as well. As a matter of fairness, when protecting a civil right, every American deserves their day in court. Second, this Congress has a duty to add a private right of action to Weldon, given that the Office for Civil Rights just stated that the Department of Justice believes the current Weldon remedy—the rescission of a state's Labor-H funds—is unconstitutional under the Supreme Court's NFIB v. Sebelius ruling. Thus, the OCR and DoJ have basically admitted that the executive branch will never enforce Weldon. Third, a Weldon private right of action would provide an alternative to rescinding a state's federal health, education and other funds—billions of dollars that support programs for those who are struggling the most. We're not interested in financially penalizing states that violate Weldon—our only interest is in bringing them into compliance with federal law. All we're seeking is the legal status quo (Weldon) with an additional remedy (a private right of action). Fourth, the OCR's recent refusal to uphold Weldon revealed another possible enforcement defect: health care insurers that are covered by Weldon, but ignore their clients' conscience rights. California's health plans acceded to the state's abortion mandate and, therefore, do not believe they can honor their clients' sincerely held moral convictions. Weldon should be clarified to ensure that purchasers of health insurance, who object to covering elective abortions, are never required to do so. Without that clarity, states, such as California and New York, will continue to discriminate against employers and health care providers that choose not to cover, pay for or provide elective abortions; and other states will inevitably follow their lead.

In conclusion, those opposed to enforcing Weldon allege two things: First, the growth of Catholic health care in states, such as Washington—where Catholic hospitals provide 40% of the acute care—is reducing access to abortion; and second, Catholic hospitals' moral beliefs result in substandard emergency care to pregnant women. In respect to the first allegation, in 2013 the State of Washington's Healthcare Research Group released a study showing that there has been no diminishment in access to abortion pursuant to the growth of Catholic hospitals in

that state. In respect to the second allegation, numerous lawsuits claiming Catholic moral beliefs result in injury to patients have not withstood even preliminary challenges in the courts. And no state or federal regulatory authority has ever cited a Catholic hospital for providing substandard emergency care to a pregnant woman. If patients were actually injured in a hospital—any hospital—damages and malpractice claims would be filed immediately. In the instances alleged in these suits, none have been filed. The injury allegations made in them are not anchored in fact, but asserted solely for political reasons to tarnish Catholic hospitals' sterling brand. Finally, and notwithstanding claims to the contrary, Catholic moral principles do not preclude Catholic hospitals from providing emergency contraception when treating rape victims. For example, in California 11 Catholic-affiliated hospitals are state-designated rape trauma centers and/or Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) sites.

Mr. Chairman, our nation is strengthened by faith-based hospitals that have been delivering care, consistent with their core convictions, for well over 150 years. This Congress needs to clarify and strengthen Dr. Weldon's amendment to enable them to continue serving their patients and communities, free from governmental compulsion to violate their moral beliefs.

Thank you.

ORAL STATEMENT OF DONNA J. HARRISON M.D., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PRO-LIFE OBSTETRICIANS AND GYNECOLOGISTS AT THE CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING: CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT, JULY 8, 2016

As Executive Director of The American Association of Pro-Life Obstetricians and Gynecologists, representing 4000 obgyns and other reproductive health care professionals, I routinely hear from medical students, residents and members of my organization who are being pressured to kill their unborn patients. I know students denied residency positions, fully tenured faculty fired for testifying in court cases, defending the lives of their fetal patients, or teaching about the scientific fact of human existence from fertilization. Physicians who practice according to the Hippocratic Oath are expelled from the medical system or prevented from entering it for refusing to cooperate in the killing of their patients. And the ACLU has recently launched a project to force hospitals to perform abortions. Through our attorneys at ADF, AAPLOG has intervened to help defend these Catholic hospitals and the pro-life medical professionals that work there. Who do you want to care for you and your family: a physician with moral integrity or a physician without moral integrity? Most patients want a physician who shares their moral values and most U.S. women think killing unborn children is wrong. Elective abortion is not medical care. Killing human beings to solve social problems is not medical care. As stated in the International Dublin Declaration on Maternal Health, and our AAPLOG mission statement, killing our unborn patients has no place in the practice of the healing arts. 85% of obstetricians do not perform elective abortions. It is not from lack of skill. We don't kill unborn patients because we went into medicine to care for both the pregnant mother and her unborn child. We don't want to be forced to use our professional skills to participate in killing one of our patients.

I speak to medical student groups across the country. Medical students tell me frequently that they are interested in obgyn, but they won't train in it because they don't want to be forced to kill unborn children. No wonder there is a shortage of obgyns and

costs are rising. On paper, federal and state conscience laws protect rights of conscience. But these students see the grim reality—those protections are worthless without a right of action when the Administration refuses to enforce the law.

Compelling medical professionals and students to perform abortions won't increase access for women's healthcare. It will force medical professionals with moral integrity out of the field. Women won't have more access to abortionists. They'll have reduced access to obgyns to meet their health needs and deliver their babies.

America used to recognize conscientious objections to killing and allow her citizens to live out their convictions in ways which do not involve taking human lives. That is what the First Amendment is about. But without an administration willing to uphold our First Amendment rights, a health care professional has little recourse. On behalf of pro-life medical professionals and the women and unborn children they serve, I urge you to pass the Conscience Protection Act.

Respectfully submitted,

DONNA J. HARRISON, M.D.,
Executive Director,
American Association
of Pro-life Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS). She is our Conference chair and also a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conscience Protection Act because, in America, we think and believe differently than each other. We are granted the freedom to believe. It is a freedom that sets us apart, makes us unique. It is not a flaw; it is special. It is spectacular, even.

Preserving this freedom is not easy. It wasn't meant to be. Living in a country where everyone is promised the right to live free according to their own beliefs and dreams is difficult. But it is a challenge that we have risen to time and time again, and we must continue to do so.

All of this is exactly why the Conscience Protection Act is so important. It stops the government from coming in and taking away a person's freedom to choose a doctor who shares their beliefs or forcing churches to make decisions that violate their conscience, like purchasing health insurance plans that go against who they are.

Importantly, it allows doctors and other healthcare providers to focus on healing and caring for their communities without the fear of having someone from the government telling them they have to do something that violates who they are and what they believe.

It is no secret, the Federal Government isn't supposed to be discriminating against healthcare providers who refuse to participate in abortion. It is against the law. Here we have the Department of Health and Human Services ignoring the law and doing whatever they want to do. Along the

way, they are ignoring people, people who wish to leave abortions out of their coverage or their medical practice.

There are a number of reasons this kind of discrimination cannot stand, but the biggest reason: people are being told what to do and what to believe by the government. In this case, it is the Department of Health and Human Services joining the ranks of countless, faceless, nameless bureaucrats who are trying to dictate what beliefs are more worthy of the protection than others. They have to stop it.

Support the Conscience Protection Act today because people who believe differently than us are promised the freedom to still find unity as communities and companies, and no one should be denied that freedom based on their unwillingness to participate in abortion. Support the Conscience Protection Act on behalf of people who are just trying to live their lives and do what they believe is the right thing.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

□ 1545

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for yielding and for all her work in this area.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today would allow a woman's boss to decide what type of medical care she is allowed to access.

Republicans are telling us that it is not up to a woman to consult her doctor or her family or her own faith—that she needs to consult with her boss when it comes to her personal, private, and constitutionally protected medical decisions.

Here we are in the midst of unprecedented public health emergencies—nearly 50 American women diagnosed with Zika every single day, a dangerously underfunded opioid response program, no relief for the families of Flint, Michigan, and the worst gun massacre in our country's history—and this is the Republican majority's priority?

The response to these emergencies is wrapping themselves in religious liberty when religious objections are already protected under our current laws, as they should be, and, instead, insert themselves into a woman's most private medical decisions.

This is no way to govern. I know it, the majority knows it, and the American people are going to remember it.

This so-called Conscience Protection Act is ironically titled because I cannot imagine a more blatant admission of this Congress' crisis of conscience. With 91 people dying every day by guns, with the threat of Zika to unborn babies unanswered and unfunded, with 125 deaths from opioids every day in this country, this bill is an abject rejection of conscience. If anyone needs their conscience protected, it is the Republicans in Congress who think this is

what we should be dealing with right now.

My question to my colleagues is this: How does your conscience feel when you remain silent in the face of such tragedy and public health threats?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), who is a true fighter on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, in 2009, President Obama, told Notre Dame University graduates:

Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion, and draft a sensible conscience clause, and make sure that all of our healthcare policies are grounded not only in sound science, but also in clear ethics.

Over the course of the ensuing 8 years, however, what the President has said and what he is doing now are completely opposite. Instead of protecting the conscience of those who disagree, the President and his administration have discriminated against Americans because of their views on abortion.

No American should be forced to participate in an abortion or be coerced to purchase a healthcare plan which includes abortion. Yet today, that is exactly what is happening. In California, churches are being forced to purchase healthcare plans and pay for abortion. Yes, churches.

In America, respecting the freedom of conscience is a long-held American tradition. Let's continue that tradition today and pass the Conscience Protection Act.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, a central principle in our Nation's history has been a clear rejection of government forcing someone to take an action that violates their religious or moral convictions.

Americans rejected being forced to return runaway slaves. We rejected forced conscription against conscientious objections. We reject being forced to support State-run churches. And now we must reject the forced participation in the killing of unborn life.

No one should be forced to have an abortion, no one should be forced to participate in an abortion, and no one should be discriminated against for refusing to collaborate in an abortion. When government endangers these protections and discriminates against healthcare providers who are holding fast to their moral convictions, it is time to provide safeguards. That is why I urge the House to pass S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act of 2016.

No one should be forced to purchase health plans that cover abortions. Certainly, no one—nurses, doctors, or other healthcare providers—should be forced to help carry out an abortion against their conscience. Certainly, no one should be punished or discrimi-

nated against for refusing to carry out this gruesome procedure.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conscience Protection Act, and I would like to thank my colleague from Tennessee for her work on this important issue.

Health care is about saving life, not taking life. Medical professionals should not be forced to violate their deeply held convictions and participate in abortion procedures based on a government mandate.

In this Nation, universities and even churches are being forced to cover abortion through their insurance plans. These mandates trample on religious freedom.

This bill, which I support here today, would stop the Federal Government and State and local governments from penalizing, retaliating, or discriminating against a healthcare provider if that provider chooses to not participate in abortion services.

I am the proud father of three boys with my wife Kristen, and I am also a practicing Catholic. I stand here today in defense of the unborn and religious freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, regardless of their faith or their views on abortion, to understand and realize that this form of government coercion is immoral. We must protect Americans' rights to follow their conscience, and I urge my colleagues to support this necessary legislation.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Conscience Protection Act, which allows employers and others to block women's access to full health care.

Under the guise of conscience protection, this is a hypocritical bill that would make it even harder for women to obtain the reproductive health care they need. It is hypocritical because it does nothing to protect the doctors whose conscience guides them to provide women with safe, legal abortions. Because of hundreds of punitive bills filled in State legislatures and in this Congress, these providers face the threat of harsh penalties for following their conscience: onerous fines, years in prison, and loss of their medical license.

With that said, Mr. Speaker, let me respectfully suggest that the consciences we should be protecting today belong to the women of this Nation, who should be allowed to choose their own reproductive destiny.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, as seen in this debate, few issues divide this country the way abortion does. One

sides argues an autonomy that allows no questions. The other implores we recognize the inalienable, God-given right to life of all human beings, a right recognized in our Declaration of Independence. Notwithstanding these divisions, our citizens have long agreed that no one should be coerced into participating in abortion or paying for an abortion.

Pro-life Americans have deeply held convictions that abortion destroys a human life. They have watched sonograms of babies in utero, and they have seen the tragic aftermath. They do not want to be involved in this procedure in any way.

Yet, from a New York nurse, who was forced against her conscience to take part in aborting a 22-week-old baby, to Catholic institutions in California being forced to pay for insurance plans that cover abortion, people of conscience are threatened. This is wrong.

Martin Luther King, Jr., a faith leader—he was a Reverend—was a powerful advocate for conscience rights. Dr. King put it simply: "Conscience asks the question, is it right?"

The Conscience Protection Act is in the long tradition of our Nation's respect for religious freedom and the protection of people of conscience. I urge support for this legislation.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 8 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Conscience Protection Act, which would prevent the Federal, State, and local government from discriminating against healthcare providers who choose not to participate in abortion.

I am a cosponsor of this bill, and I stand before you today as a surgeon who has practiced for over two and half decades. I want to say clearly that no healthcare provider should be forced to participate in abortion or any medical or surgical procedure, for that matter, against their will.

Doctors take an oath to do no harm. I took that oath myself. Health care is about protecting life, not taking life. Make no mistake about it, I am pro-life.

Forcing healthcare providers to violate their conscience is a rejection of the individual liberty on which our Nation is built.

And even more to make a point, what patient would want a doctor to perform a procedure—any procedure—that they don't feel comfortable with, for whatever reason they don't feel comfortable with it?

This defies human reason. Enforcing it defies human freedom in this, the land of the free, or so we say.

Healthcare providers are not owned by the government or any other entity. No American is owned by the government or any other entity. This protection is long overdue, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this crucial bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, when I started this debate, I said that this bill is really a wolf in sheep's clothing. And I meant it.

We have heard throughout this last hour many calls for conscience, many assertions that people shouldn't be forced to perform abortions against their religious convictions. We even just now saw a quote from my hero, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., here on the floor, talking about civil rights.

Well, guess what?

As speaker after speaker on our side has pointed out, under current law, providers are not required to provide abortions. This has been the law since the 1970s, when the Church amendment was passed.

In the 1970s, when the Church amendment was passed—it has been law ever since then—I was in high school at that time. It says that providers do not have to provide abortions against their religious convictions, and they have legal recourse if they don't want to do it.

The Church amendment was expanded in 2005 by the so-called Weldon amendment, which has been an appropriations rider since that time. What the Weldon amendment says is that no Federal funding will be made available to government entities that subject a healthcare entity, physicians, hospitals, or HMOs to discrimination because it does not provide, pay for, cover or refer for abortions.

So, in fact, under current law, if somebody is being made to provide abortion services against their will, they have recourse.

And guess what?

In every single example that the majority gave today, they had recourse. And they won.

Let's talk about the Catherine DeCarlo case, the nurse in New York that so many of my colleagues have referred to, who, by her employer, was required, against her ethical convictions, to provide abortion services. She filed a complaint with the Office for Civil Rights, as she is allowed to under law. An investigation ensued.

And guess what?

The hospital was required to take remedial action and change their policy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the decision from the Department of Health and Human Services entered under the Obama administration giving Ms. DeCarlo these rights.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH &
HUMAN SERVICES,
February 1, 2013.

Re Reference Number: 10-109676

MATTHEW S. BOWMAN, ESQ.,
Alliance Defending Freedom,
Washington, DC.

DAVID REICH, MD,
Interim President, The Mount Sinai Hospital,
New York, NY.

DEAR MR. BOWMAN AND DR. REICH: The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Office for Civil Rights (OCR), has completed its investigation of the above-referenced complaint filed by the Alliance Defending Freedom, formerly known as the Alliance Defense Fund (the complainant), on behalf of Catherina Lorena Cenzone-DeCarlo (the affected party) against The Mount Sinai Hospital (the Hospital). The complaint alleges that, on May 24, 2009, the Hospital forced the affected party to assist in the performance of an abortion procedure despite her express religious objections. The complaint also alleges that, because of the affected party's initial refusal to participate in the May 24, 2009 procedure, the Hospital discriminated against her by: (i) reducing the number of on-call shifts she received for the month of August 2009; and (ii) asking her to sign a statement of her willingness to participate in abortion procedures in emergencies as a condition to being assigned more on-call shifts for September 2009 than she was assigned for August 2009.

OCR initiated an investigation of this complaint consistent with its authority under the Church Amendments, 42 U.S.C. §300a-7; Section 245 of the Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. §238n; and the Weldon Amendment, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008, Public Law 110-161, Div. G, §508(d), 121 Stat. 1844, 2209 (collectively referred to as the Federal health care provider conscience statutes) and their implementing regulation, 45 C.F.R. Part 88.

According to information available on its website, the Hospital is a 1,171-bed tertiary-care teaching facility that oversees approximately 58,000 patients receiving inpatient care, 530,000 outpatient visits, and 98,000 emergency room visits each year. The Hospital is part of The Mount Sinai Medical Center. The Hospital receives federal financial assistance from HHS under the Public Health Service Act and through its participation in Medicare and Medicaid.

During the course of the investigation, OCR reviewed information submitted by the complainant and the Hospital. OCR interviewed the complainant, the affected party, Hospital staff and administration, and physicians providing services at the Hospital. OCR also coordinated the handling of the complaint with the staff of the HHS program(s) from which the Hospital receives HHS funding.

The complainant indicated that the affected party has been employed in the Hospital's Perioperative Services Care Center since August 9, 2004, and has strongly-held religious beliefs and moral convictions that she should not participate in abortion procedures. During the course of its investigation, OCR learned that elective abortion procedures are scheduled on weekdays at the Hospital, staffed by individuals who have agreed in advance to participate in such procedures. Urgent/non-elective abortion procedures that occur over the weekend are staffed by Operating Room (O.R.) nurses and surgical technicians who have signed up and are assigned to be "on call" for that specific weekend. The complainant indicated that the affected party was on on-call and called to the O.R. for a procedure to take place during the morning of Sunday, May 24, 2009. The com-

plainant informed OCR that, shortly after the affected party learned that the case was an abortion procedure, she reminded her supervisor of her religious objection and asked to be excused from the case, but the Hospital insisted that she assist in the procedure.

During OCR's investigation of this matter, the Hospital stated that it did not force the affected party to assist in the performance of an abortion procedure, and that it did not discriminate or retaliate against her for her initial refusal to assist in the abortion procedure. Nonetheless, the Hospital also indicated that, since the events of May 24, 2009, it has implemented measures to address the administrative issues that prevented the Hospital from locating a replacement nurse for the affected party on the day of the procedure.

In particular, OCR learned that the Hospital adopted a revision to its O.R. scheduling policies and procedures, effective August 2009, which requires abortion procedures to be scheduled with the O.R. with as much notice as possible. The revised policy also establishes a process wherein the Hospital maintains: (i) contact information for the O.R. nurses and surgical technicians, and (ii) a list indicating which nurses and surgical technicians are willing to participate, and which are not willing to participate, in abortion procedures. Further, the revised policy instructs O.R. scheduling staff and on-duty nurse managers that, in the event on-call O.R. nurses or surgical technicians must be called in for an abortion procedure, the O.R. scheduling staff must inform the on-duty nurse manager. If the scheduled on-call O.R. nurse or surgical technician is listed as being unwilling to assist, the scheduling staff (and the nurse manager) will use the aforementioned lists to contact and secure an O.R. nurse or surgical technician, as appropriate, who is willing to assist in the performance of an abortion.

Subsequently as a result of OCR's investigation, the Hospital has agreed to take certain other actions to ensure and strengthen its commitment and ongoing compliance with the applicable Federal health care provider conscience statutes. OCR notes that the Hospital has taken significant affirmative steps to address the compliance concerns identified in the complaint, and the following listed actions provide additional safeguards for objecting health care personnel while ensuring patients have access to needed health care. Specifically, the Hospital has agreed in writing to:

1. Comply with the provisions of the Church Amendments, 42 U.S.C. §300a-7 et seq.
2. Continue to use its best efforts to ensure that non-objecting health care personnel are available to perform their job duties with respect to abortion procedures, including any abortion procedures that occur over the weekend;
3. Revise Human Resources Policy No. 15.3, titled "Exclusion from Patient Care—Employee Rights," to state that "The Mount Sinai Hospital does not discriminate in the employment, promotion, or termination of employment of any physician or other health care personnel, or in the extension of staff or other privileges to any physician or other health care personnel, because he or she performed or assisted in the performance of a lawful sterilization procedure or abortion, or because he or she refused to perform or assist in the performance of such a sterilization procedure or abortion on the grounds that his performance or assistance would be contrary to his religious beliefs or moral convictions."
4. Continue to post the Hospital's Human Resources Policy No. 15.3, titled "Exclusion from Patient Care—Employee Rights," electronically on the Hospital's intranet and

post in hard copy on the Operating Room notice board; and

5. Train O.R. managers, nurses and surgical technicians about the Hospital's obligations to comply with the Church Amendments and train Surgical Admitting Planning office administrative staff to ensure that O.R. nurses' and surgical technicians' objecting or non-objecting status is properly recorded.

In addition, OCR provided the Hospital with technical assistance regarding its grievance procedure and its list identifying whether O.R. nurses and surgical technicians are willing or not to participate in abortion procedures. The Hospital incorporated OCR's technical assistance, further ensuring the Hospital's compliance with the applicable Federal health care provider conscience statutes.

Based on the above-described commitments and actions, OCR finds that the Hospital took steps, subsequent to May 24, 2009, and during the course of OCR's investigation, which have sufficiently addressed and resolved the allegation regarding the May 24, 2009 procedure.

With respect to the allegation that the Hospital discriminated against the affected party by reducing the amount of weekend on-call shifts to which she was assigned for August 2009, the evidence gathered during OCR's investigation did not support such a finding. The affected party asserted that there were multiple sign-up sheets and she had signed up for approximately 7-8 on-call shifts for August 2009. The Hospital indicated that there was only one set of sign-up sheets, and the affected party signed up for a single shift, which the Hospital assigned to her. While the Hospital's documentation does not definitively establish that there was not a second set of sign-up sheets for August 2009, OCR's interviews of multiple O.R. nurses indicate that O.R. nurses and surgical technicians signed up at a single location on a single set of sign-in sheets. Accordingly, OCR has determined that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that the Hospital discriminated against the affected party when assigning on-call shifts for the month of August 2009.

The complainant also alleged that the Hospital discriminated against the affected party by asking her to sign a statement of her willingness to participate in abortion procedures in emergencies as a condition to being assigned more on-call shifts for September 2009 than she was assigned for August 2009. After interviewing the affected party and other staff involved in the alleged conversations, OCR found that at least one conversation occurred on or about July 16, 2009, involving a request for the affected party to sign a statement. However, there was substantial dispute as to the substantive content of any conversation, including the content of any requested statement. Based on our review of the facts and circumstances of this matter, including that the affected party did not agree to sign any statement and the Hospital subsequently assigned her on-call shifts for September 2009 after she signed up for them, OCR has determined that there is insufficient evidence to substantiate the claim that the Hospital discriminated against the affected party by asking her to sign such a statement.

Further, on February 4, 2011, the complainant contacted OCR to report an alleged act of retaliation by the Hospital against the affected party for the filing of this complaint. Following the May 24, 2009 procedure that is the subject of this matter, the affected party sought assistance from the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) at the Hospital. The complainant alleged that, on February 3, 2011, the Hospital informed the affected party that it would not provide her with a

copy of her EAP records unless she first obtained a court order, because the affected party had filed OCR and judicial complaints against the Hospital. A claim that the Hospital's actions with respect to the affected party's EAP records amounts to another act of discrimination under the Church Amendments is not supported by the evidence. During OCR's investigation of the complainants associated HIPAA Privacy Rule complaint, TN 11-123374, OCR learned that all employees of the Hospital who seek to obtain a copy of their EAP records must first obtain a court order or subpoena, regardless of whether: (i) the employee has or has not filed a complaint or lawsuit against the Hospital, or (ii) the employee has or has not refused to assist with an abortion procedure, and irrespective of what the employee's religious beliefs are about abortion.

This determination of compliance is not intended, nor should it be construed, to cover any issues, regarding the Hospital's compliance status with the Church Amendments, that are not specifically addressed in this letter. It neither covers issues or authorities not specifically addressed herein nor does it preclude future determinations of compliance that are based on subsequent investigations.

Please take all necessary steps to ensure that no adverse action is taken against the complainant, the affected party, or any other individual for the filing of this complaint, providing information to OCR, or otherwise participating in this investigation.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, it may be necessary for OCR to release this document and related correspondence and records upon request. In the event OCR receives such a request, we will seek to protect, to the extent provided by law, personal information the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy.

If you have additional questions or concerns, please contact Frank J. Musumeci, M.S., Supervisory Equal Opportunity Specialist.

Sincerely,

LINDA C. COLÓN,
Regional Manager.

Ms. DEGETTE. Now, let's talk about the nine Nassau County nurses apparently required by their employer to provide these services. All of those nurses were reinstated to their job after they made a complaint.

According to any example that we have gotten, these people have had recourse under current law.

So what does this bill do?

This bill doesn't give anybody any more conscientious ability to object.

□ 1600

What this bill does is it allows whole new classes of people to refuse to provide services to the women of America. It allows employers, it allows healthcare plans and health plan sponsors to refuse to provide women the services they need.

The only people who are going to be hurt by this are the patients. And I will tell you what, if you want to talk about civil rights, talk about the civil rights of those patients.

Talk about Mindy Swank, who is a woman from Illinois. She was denied care by a Catholic hospital when her water broke just 20 weeks into her pregnancy. Even though her life would have been endangered by continuing

the pregnancy and it could have threatened her ability to have more children in the future, the hospital she visited not only refused to treat her, but it refused to provide documentation that her abortion was medically necessary so somebody else could treat her.

She was forced to wait weeks, returning to the hospital four times with bleeding, until finally she was deemed sick enough to induce labor and give birth to a baby who died without ever regaining consciousness. Talk about her civil rights. That is what we are thinking about today.

So I have got to say—I am a deeply religious person myself—I believe that we should give people their rights to their religious expression, and we do that under current law. I don't think that taking women's rights to health care away does anything to help with that situation.

Here is one more thing. In case you didn't know, President Obama issued an order today saying that he is going to veto this bill if, in the unlikely event, it ever passes his desk.

So what are we doing here today? The majority has announced that they are going out of session for 7 weeks at the end of this week. They are not going to deal with the Zika funding. They are not going to deal with gun safety legislation, which would save many Americans' lives. They are not going to finish the appropriations bills, on and on and on.

We have spent a whole hour of our valuable time today debating about something that is not only unnecessary from a conscience point of view, but that could endanger women's lives, and we are doing nothing to help the lives of the millions and millions of Americans that need it.

It is not the right focus. It is not the right time. It is not the right legislation. I urge every single one of my colleagues to examine their conscience and to vote "no" on this poorly thought-out piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, let me talk for just a minute about what some of this does. We have spent a whole hour here, yes, defending the Constitution, standing up for an individual's right.

This bill does not do a few things. It doesn't clog the courts. It doesn't hamper due process; it increases it. It doesn't create confusion; it creates clarity. It doesn't stop you from getting care. It doesn't offend conscience. It isn't vindictive. It isn't hypocritical.

What it does do is state that someone has this right.

The bill doesn't ban abortion. It doesn't take away rights. The bill doesn't remove lifesaving protections for women. And third, the bill doesn't force pregnant women from foregoing chemotherapy, all claims that we have heard.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, today we heard quite a few claims that were made, and I would like to set the RECORD straight.

First of all, the bill before us today simply protects the other right to choose, that is the right of healthcare providers to choose not to be involved in abortion. The bill does not change the legality of abortion in any way.

Some of my colleagues have raised concerns regarding how this bill may affect life-threatening cases. As a nurse who has worked in the emergency room, I can tell you that medical personnel always—always—act to save patients who come through their doors, including pregnant women and their babies. It is that compassion and that drive to protect life that brought them to the medical profession in the first place.

Furthermore, stabilizing a woman when her life is in danger is the law. It is already the law. There is a standard of care and there is a law. Under the Emergency Medical Treatment and the Active Labor Act, doctors and hospitals are required to stabilize emergency patients, including pregnant women.

So to be absolutely sure there is no confusion on this point, the Conscience Protection Act includes a rule of construction that clarifies those protections and EMTALA will continue to co-exist side by side, offering women the assurance that they will be cared for in these situations.

We protect insurance plans and employers purchasing such plans from participation in abortion in this bill because that is the very scenario that has prompted the consideration of the bill.

Abortion is a highly controversial issue on which Americans have a wide range of views. It is reasonable to allow anyone who does not want to be a party to abortion to be able to opt out.

Recognizing this point, even President Obama's healthcare law, ObamaCare, allows States and insurance companies to opt out of including abortion in the health plans offered on the exchanges.

My bill simply ensures that the healthcare providers, as defined in the bill, are not forced or coerced to participate in a brutal procedure that is often painful to an unborn child.

I urge a "yes" vote on this bill.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to S. 304, the so-called "Conscience Protection Act."

This bill would allow employers, insurance companies, and other health care entities to refuse to provide, pay for, cover, or refer for abortion services.

This is an overreaching and dangerous proposal under which employers, among others, could deny women comprehensive health insurance coverage and intrude on their personal health care decisions.

This legislation is unnecessary since existing federal law already protects individuals

who do not want to participate in abortion care and many states have refusal clauses for individual who wish to refuse to participate in abortion care.

A woman's medical decisions should be left up to her and her physician; they should not be vulnerable to the arbitrary discrimination of an employer or other outside party.

As responsible lawmakers, we have a duty to reject any and all provisions that seek to codify a health care system in which discrimination against women is legal and encouraged.

The Supreme Court has upheld the right of women to choose regarding this matter.

It is time that we move on from attempts to undermine this right and instead focus on improving health care quality and access for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing S. 304.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 822, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Wasserman Schultz moves to recommit the bill, S. 304, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. NO IMPACT ON RESPONSE TO ZIKA VIRUS.

The provisions of section 3, including the amendment made by such section, shall not apply to the extent that such provisions would reduce access to health care services to prevent, prepare for, or respond to the Zika virus.

Mrs. BLACKBURN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. 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.

S. 304, the Conscience Protection Act, is yet another extreme attempt to block women's access to health care. This dangerous legislation, which the President has threatened to veto, would strip away patient protections and permit employers to override a

woman's personal medical decisions. It is the 113th House GOP vote in this Congress alone to attack women's health care.

This bill is an attempt to make permanent the so-called Weldon amendment, which pressures any Federal agency or program, or any State or local government, with the potential loss of all of its Labor and Health and Human Services funding if it doesn't allow a healthcare entity to provide, pay for, cover, or refer for abortions.

The majority purports that this legislation would protect religious liberty, but, in reality, it is a thinly veiled attempt to restrict women's access to safe and legal abortion.

To be clear, religious liberty is one of our Nation's most fundamental and cherished values, but it does not, and should never, mean the freedom to discriminate against or harm others. This bill would unduly limit women's healthcare choices by allowing a broad set of health providers, including many employers, to deny their female employees access to legal medical services based on any and all objections.

This legislation could not possibly have been written more broadly. Specifically, the Conscience Protection Act would allow employers and insurance companies, among other "healthcare entities," to refuse to "facilitate," "make arrangements for," or "otherwise participate in" abortions.

Women of color, low-income families, LGBTQ individuals, young people, and those living in rural areas already experience widespread and systemic barriers to health care. This vague and overly broad language will exacerbate the significant barriers to care that they already face.

Additionally, the bill would give virtually any individual or entity standing to sue for an actual or threatened violation. As civil rights organizations have noted:

This broad right of action would chill State, local, and Federal Government's ability to advance pro-women's health policies by exposing them to frivolous, resource-draining lawsuits by opponents of safe, legal abortion.

Undoubtedly, this bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing. In the name of religious liberty, the majority is continuing its campaign to deny women access to safe and legal abortion and create a healthcare system that is legally permitted to discriminate against women.

Women and all Americans deserve access to the care and coverage that is right for them. The Conscience Protection Act threatens that access and is another attempt by the majority to insert themselves into a decision best left between a woman and her doctor.

This motion to recommit prevents the harmful provisions of the bill from applying to any area in the U.S. where it would reduce access to healthcare services to prevent, prepare for, or respond to the Zika virus.

More than 3,600 Americans, including more than 600 pregnant women in 45

States, D.C., and 3 U.S. territories, have already been diagnosed with the Zika virus, and more transmission is expected. In my home State of Florida, there are more than 250 people that have contracted Zika, including 43 pregnant women. During pregnancy, the Zika virus can cause a serious birth defect called microcephaly, as well other severe fetal brain defects.

The Zika virus is primarily transmitted through two types of mosquitos, and according to a recent article in the Journal of Medical Entomology, 40 States and D.C. have reported the presence of one or both of those mosquitos.

Public health experts have made clear that it is not if we will have local transmission of the Zika virus in the continental U.S., it is when. Despite that risk, our Republican colleagues are on the floor today playing politics with women and children's access to federally supported healthcare services like Medicaid.

Through Federal healthcare services, women can visit healthcare providers to better understand how to prevent contracting the Zika virus, and children born with severe fetal brain defects can receive the healthcare services that they need.

Threatening receipt of Federal healthcare services by women and children in need of care to advance the harmful Republican war on women is unconscionable. It is shocking that anyone would even consider taking any action that would cut off federally supported healthcare services when the threat of the Zika virus looms so large in this country, especially during the summer, the height of tourist and mosquito season.

This bill is dangerous and irresponsible. Pregnant women who contract the Zika virus and infants born with microcephaly or severe fetal birth defects as a result should have the federally guaranteed healthcare benefits and services that they need and not be punished because the Republicans wanted to score more political points.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I pose a simple question: When did this institution and the political discourse lose respect for freedom of conscience protections in health care?

It is not fair. It is not fair that individuals today may have legal recourse to protect their civil rights but not

their constitutionally safeguarded conscience rights.

This straightforward bill reaffirms the Weldon amendment protections, gives individuals and entities a private right of action, and makes sure that nothing prevents providers from voluntarily electing to take part in an abortion.

It is written to protect a person like Fe Vinoya, who is one of the nurses from New Jersey. During a Conscience Forum just last week, Fe said:

Participating in the destruction of human life is not only a violation of my religious convictions, it conflicts with my calling as a medical professional to protect life, not to end life.

We owe this to Fe and anyone else who objects to being forced to provide or to pay for abortion services. So I simply urge you, I implore Members to vote "no" on the motion to recommit and to vote "yes" on the Conscience Protection Act of 2016.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1615

NO 2H2O FROM IRAN ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 819, I call up the bill (H.R. 5119) to prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds available to any Federal department or agency for any fiscal year to purchase or issue a license for the purchase of heavy water produced in Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 819, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5119

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 "No ²H₂O from Iran Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON OBLIGATION OR EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS TO PURCHASE OR ISSUE A LICENSE FOR THE PURCHASE OF HEAVY WATER PRODUCED IN IRAN.

No funds available to any Federal department or agency for any fiscal year may be obligated or expended—

(1) to purchase heavy water produced in Iran; or

(2) to issue a license for the purchase of heavy water produced in Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I rise in support of this bill. What this would do is prohibit the United States from spending millions of dollars purchasing from Iran heavy water. Iran—I think we should remember—is the number one state sponsor of terrorism. Heavy water is essential to the production of weapons-grade plutonium.

While this relatively rare chemical is not radioactive, it has long been tightly controlled. Why? Because of its use as a coolant in heavy water nuclear reactors. These are the types of reactors which experts call a plutonium bomb factory.

The history of this goes back. If we think back during the Second World War, the fall of Norway and its heavy water plant to the Nazis created a very real risk that Hitler could win the race to build the bomb. In response, at the time, the Allies launched several daring commando raids—the most daring of the war—and hundreds of bombers in what was ultimately their successful effort to prevent the Nazis from using heavy water to develop weapons-grade plutonium. That is how important this process has been in history in the race to that weapon.

So fast forward several decades, and now the Obama administration's nuclear agreement does not limit Iran's ability to produce heavy water. This is one of the agreement's many flaws, in my opinion. But, instead, the deal allows Iran to possess a small amount of heavy water for its newly legitimized nuclear program and requires Iran to ship any excess heavy water that it produces out of the country.

So, while this deeply flawed deal allows Iran to sell its excess heavy water on the international market, it certainly doesn't require the United States to buy Iran's excess heavy water. If there are no buyers, then Iran would have to comply with the limits on its heavy water possession by suspending production, or it could also dilute any excess heavy water that it currently possesses. That makes sense to me.

Let me be clear. Despite false claims, enacting this legislation would not cause the United States or Iran to violate the nuclear deal. What we are talking about here is something that is not in the deal, whether or not we subsidize their production of heavy water.

So what it would prevent, clearly, is it would prevent the administration from going above and beyond the agreement to deliver Iran financial rewards that were never part of the agreement that passed this House.

That is one of the reasons why the Obama administration's purchase of 28

metric tons of heavy water from Iran is so concerning. Purchases like this only—as I indicated—subsidize and incentivize Iran's continued production of this sensitive material that plays an essential role in the production of weapons-grade plutonium.

I just want to go to the words of David Albright, which I think all of us should reflect on here. He is a respected nonproliferation expert, and he said these words: We should not be paying Iran for something they shouldn't be producing in the first place.

That is my point, Mr. Speaker. So this bill is simple. It prohibits U.S. purchases, prohibits us paying Iran for heavy water from their facility, and, thus, prevents U.S. taxpayer dollars from subsidizing this rogue regime.

I also want to thank the author, Mr. POMPEO, for his work. I urge all Members to support this bill.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, by now, everyone knows that I opposed the Iran nuclear deal. But as I have said again and again and again, now that the deal is done, we need to focus on holding Iran's leaders to their word and holding the regime accountable for its other bad behavior. I think you would be hard-pressed to find any Member of this body who disagrees with that goal.

But there is a right way to do that and a wrong way to do it. The right way to do it is to collaborate across the aisle to draft legislation that will win bipartisan support, that will make it across the finish line, and that the President will sign into law.

The right way to do it is to let committees go through a regular process, a regular order, so that Members on both sides have a chance to debate and contribute.

The right way to do it is to bring it to the floor in a way that ensures we end up with the best possible legislation so that we can honestly advance American interests and protect American security.

The wrong way to do it is to ram it through the Rules Committee—that is what happens here—and bring it to the floor with no chance to offer new ideas to make the bill better. But that is exactly where we are today. That is why this bill is so deeply flawed. That is why it has no chance of becoming law, and that is a shame, in my opinion, because this bill might have been a good starting point.

Again, I think we do need to deal with Iran more forcefully. Generally speaking, I agree that we shouldn't be buying heavy water from Iran. But this bill is far too broad. It is a blanket prohibition—no waivers, no sunset, no exceptions. We have no idea what the unintended consequences of this bill could be in the years ahead. Those are the uncertainties we try to deal with on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

So pull it out of a committee's jurisdiction, give it to the Rules Committee, and the Foreign Affairs Committee really has no say in what is truly an important Foreign Affairs Committee bill.

Mr. Speaker, traditionally, the House Iran-related bills have been bipartisan. The way we have dealt with Iran has maybe been the best example of non-partisan collaboration on foreign policy, or bipartisan collaboration on foreign policy, and politics stopping at the water's edge. But in this case, the Speaker has totally circumvented the Foreign Affairs Committee and our normal bipartisan approach. I think there are serious consequences to the process that led us here. We are sending a message to the rest of the world that foreign policy issues are now part of everyday politics. This is a dangerous path.

I don't blame my good friend Chairman ROYCE for this lousy process. This isn't the way he runs our committee, and I am grateful, as always, for his fair leadership. Tomorrow, we are marking up 13 bipartisan measures in our committee. That is the way it should be. We pride ourselves in bipartisanship. That is how you pass legislation in foreign policy, and that is exactly what we are not doing here this afternoon.

But I am left to wonder, what happened to the Speaker's commitment to regular order? When he became Speaker, that was the platform he rode in on. What do our friends in the Freedom Caucus and the Liberty Caucus have to say about the Speaker's change of heart? It just isn't right.

It leads to bad policy. Foreign policy is rarely black and white. There are very few times when it is smart to say: "This is the right way to go, without exception, in perpetuity." That is what the bill does. Complexity isn't a vice in foreign policy, and sometimes bills that are only a page or two long are the most dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that we are spending time on a measure that we all know isn't going anywhere and that we all know is just political theater as my friends in the majority move into the convention next week. We could be using this time in an honest effort to make our country safer with this issue, which is an important issue. But a flawed process has led to a flawed bill, and I am forced to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on H.R. 5119.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), the author of this legislation.

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the chairman for the gentleman's good work on policing and performing oversight on the JCPOA.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 5119, to prevent the United States purchase of heavy water from Iran.

I want to start by pointing out the recent statements from the Department of State and the Department of Energy confirming that the United States was under no commitment to purchase heavy water from Iran nor is it committed to do so in the future. The Obama administration only acknowledged this fact last month as a result of a congressional inquiry from my office.

This legislation is really very simple and as straightforward as you can get. H.R. 5119, the No 2H2O from Iran Act, would prohibit Federal funds from being used to purchase heavy water and also prohibit Federal funds from being used to issue licenses to purchase heavy water from Iran.

Tomorrow marks the 1-year anniversary of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. This week, the House is taking a stand against Iran and the dangerous deal this Nation entered into—reflecting very much what I hear when I am back in Kansas.

Americans know President Obama's unsigned and unratified political commitment with the Islamic Republic of Iran does not make them safer. Americans see Iran continue to test sophisticated ballistic missiles. They see Iran capture and humiliate American sailors. They see Iran hold Americans and other foreigners hostage. They see Iran fire rockets dangerously close to American aircraft carriers.

While many constituents are back home watching us vote on this issue, the Iranian Ayatollah is watching this too. I know this because Iran is desperate. On Monday, it announced that it had received \$8.6 million in exchange for 32 tons of Iranian heavy water that the Obama administration wanted to purchase back in April.

Only then, only after the Iranians had chosen to reveal the status of this funding, shortly before this very vote, did the Obama administration come clean to the American public with some details of this sale.

Mr. Speaker, must we always find out what is happening between the United States and Iran from the Iranians?

Mr. Speaker, my bill will protect Americans and ensure the United States does not become an active partner in Iran's nuclear program and its terror regime. We cannot legitimize this nuclear proliferator. We have already done enough for the Islamic Republic of Iran. We need not act outside the requirements of the nuclear deal, no matter how much Iranian mullahs

complain and no matter how much they threaten.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, one year ago, our country made the correct decision. We all agreed that Iran should not have a nuclear weapons program, but we decided the better way to achieve that was through diplomacy rather than war.

Today, we deal with yet another challenge to that agreement. The material involved is heavy water. For those who thought that war and military action was the only way to prevent nuclear weapons development in Iran, heavy water is the issue today, but it is just another way to sink a successful agreement.

□ 1630

When you look at the facts, how can it possibly be in our national interest to take away our own authority to take away from Iran a material that could be used in the development of nuclear weapons?

I don't think this is just about heavy water. When you consider the facts and all that is represented here, it is a heavy lift, or a heavy stretch, to believe that limiting ourselves somehow will protect our families.

There are a number of nonmilitary uses for heavy water. The water we are getting from Iran can be used by U.S. industry and research labs. Heavy water is a critical material for biomedical and diagnostic research, such as MRIs and pharmaceutical development, as well as a variety of chemical and environmental analysis.

By purchasing this material, we make our families and allies safer and boost American research and development. Exposed to light, objections to our procuring this heavy water really do evaporate.

In World War II, many lives were lost to keep heavy water developed by a Norwegian utility from being used by Nazi Germany for development of a nuclear weapon. Here, we are using dollars instead of the lives of young Americans and others to ensure there is no nuclear weapons development within Iran and that there is less of this dual-use material in Iran, and more of it in America.

I realize the strong desire here on the eve of the Republican National Convention to undermine any success this Administration has. But I believe this is a bipartisan success. That is one of the reasons that a large number of experts on security policy—and former Members of this body in the United States Senate, both Republicans and Democrats—have joined together in bipartisan support of an agreement that is working and that is making our families safer.

Don't vote to undermine the efforts of this international agreement. Don't drown diplomacy by adopting this heavy water bill.

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

Again, the reality today is that the agreement was not intended to be structured in a way that would give an inducement for Iran to go forward with a production of heavy water and the export of heavy water because, as we all know, in 15 years this agreement is going to be over. At that point in time, we do not want Iran to have a full-scale industrial weapons production capability.

If we create the market for heavy water—right now under the agreement they are not supposed to have it on hand—if we create the market by continuously purchasing this heavy water, yeah, they are going to continue to produce it and, as a consequence, will further develop their capability.

It is odd to me also, since the sale represents a government intrusion into the North American heavy water market, why we would prefer Iran continue the capability of developing this as opposed to an American ally, Canada.

Why would we open the door to future U.S. purchases of Iran's heavy water, which is what the administration is doing here, and choose Iran as the supplier rather than our ally, Canada?

For these reasons, I am very concerned with that line of argument.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this week, the administration agreed to a catastrophic nuclear deal with Iran, a deal that was eventually rejected by Congress in a bipartisan vote.

Despite negotiating from what should have been a position of strength, the Obama administration has gone out of its way to appease Iran. And even more disturbing, the administration admitted that it used a false narrative to sell the nuclear deal to journalists and, ultimately, to the American public.

As if the deal wasn't bad enough, the administration has made it a point to make concession after concession in order to keep Iran happy. The President tells us that Iran is honoring the deal, but German intelligence tells us they are not. We were promised snap-back sanctions, but the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury have been flying around Europe promoting Iran while trying to find creative ways to give Iran access to the U.S. dollar. Lately, it seems that our cabinet secretaries are acting more like ambassadors-at-large for the Iranian Chamber of Commerce than Secretary of the Treasury and Secretary of State.

We were told this deal wasn't about normalizing relations with Iran, but the administration reportedly is weighing whether to back Iran's bid to join the World Trade Organization. Rather

than just adhere to the deal, we are going above and beyond. We are using taxpayer dollars to buy heavy water from Iran and indirectly eating Iran's nefarious destabilizing activities in the region.

The administration claimed they understood the concerns of our ally, Israel; but Iran violated the U.S. resolution by firing a ballistic missile that said Israel must be wiped off the face of the Earth.

Mr. Speaker, the administration assured us that they are going to push back on Iran's destabilizing activities and human rights concerns, but 12 months later it seems like we have only empowered them.

If the administration won't hold Iran accountable, then the responsibility falls on the people's House.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Iran-related measures on the floor this week.

The ranking member, a few minutes ago, made a point of suggesting that there is no chance that the President would sign this bill, and that we are wasting our time by debating it here today. It is incumbent on us to call out the shortcomings on this deal. It is incumbent on the House and the Members of the House to point out when Iran has violated the deal. As I said frequently during the debate, you cannot do a good deal with a bad guy.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill.

I am listening to the debate and, frankly, it is interesting to have the two diametrically opposed views. This agreement a year ago was supported by a range of former Secretaries of State in both parties. It was an opportunity to move forward with our principal allies and with China and with Russia to try and make Iran less likely to develop nuclear weapons.

Mercifully, the agreement is in force, and for this first year it is working. There is a reactor filled with concrete. This item here today is an example of progress that my friends on the other side of the aisle want to turn back. Under this agreement, they are required to reduce the supply of heavy water. We are purchasing heavy water from them, taking it out of their hands. At the same time, there are 14,000 fewer centrifuges that are operating in Iran and under international supervision.

Why wouldn't we want to take away this essential element for the production of nuclear weapons, especially since the United States has an opportunity to purchase heavy water?

As my good friend from Texas pointed out, there are many research applications for which we need heavy water.

My friend, the chairman of the committee, alluded to the question: Why don't we use the North American production of heavy water?

Well, the United States doesn't manufacture heavy water anymore, and Canada has stopped producing it and is selling it off.

Where are we going to get the heavy water from?

I think it is perfect to get it from Iran. We use it, it is beneficial to us, and it takes a potential dangerous item out of their hands.

I think the House should reject yet another effort to undermine the agreement. The world is safer today than it was a year ago when Iran was a month or 2 away from creating a nuclear weapon, and it created a frenzy on the part of some of the people who are justifiably concerned about Iran. Now that breakout date is a year away and we are strengthening the potential ties.

The United States has serially mismanaged its relations with Iran since we worked with the British to overthrow their popularly elected government in 1953 and install a dictator, the shah, in charge. The United States backed the murderous Saddam Hussein in the Iraq-Iranian war when Saddam Hussein used poisonous gas against Iran.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that Iran is one of the few countries in the Middle East where the majority of the people still like the United States, unlike some of our so-called allies over there.

Admittedly, there are people in the leadership in Iran who are bad people who do bad things. The President of Iran has worked with us to try and move the ball forward. This agreement is a foundation upon which we can build. I am pleased that maybe they would buy airplanes from us rather than the French or the European Union Airbus consortium.

I hope that we can get behind the reflexive opposition to this and look at the facts. I think the facts are, at a minimum, we should buy all of the heavy water from Iran we can at a market rate, get it out of their hands, and help us with our needs.

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

I think there is some confusion here. The point is that Iran is continuing to manufacture heavy water. The point is that we are making a market for their ability to export this instead of taking the legacy stock of heavy water that is in the possession of Canada.

The reason Canada quit producing it is because they have ample stock, and the presumption was they would sell that to the United States. Why? Because Canada is not in the business of trying to become more proficient in de-

veloping a market for something which can be used for nuclear weapons production.

We have ample opportunity to purchase this from our ally. It is still a requirement under the agreement that Iran cut back its reserve of heavy water. If we are going to enter an ongoing program to continue to purchase this from Iran, what we are doing is enabling them, enabling them as they prepare 15 years from now, as I said earlier, to have that turnkey operation where they can then have industrial-size capability for the weapons program.

The other point I would make is that the reason the Iranians have a favorable disposition towards the United States—and that is reflected in the polling that shows that two-thirds of Iranians want a western-style democracy without a theocracy—is because they don't happen to agree with the policies of the Ayatollah and what happened in 1979 with the revolutionary regime grabbing control of that government.

The consequences of that government nationalizing companies is that the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps actually controls the economy. When we put money into that regime, what we are actually doing is aiding and abetting the efforts of those that go to the streets and yell "Death to America" and "Death to Israel," and that is exactly what the Ayatollah does.

We should have had a tilt to Iran, yes; but that tilt to Iran should have been to the people of Iran who had that election stolen from them.

□ 1645

That is where our tilt should have been. Instead, we are walking on eggshells, and every time there is a new demand like this one, that we now purchase and aid and abet their ongoing development of capability on heavy water, it is beyond me. We have an annual report that was published last month by the German Intelligence Service, and this is what it reads:

The illegal proliferation-sensitive procurement activities by Iran in Germany, registered by the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution, persisted at what is, even by international standards, a quantitatively high level last year. This holds true, in particular, with regard to items which can be used in the field of nuclear technology.

Iran is violating this agreement as we speak. It is not being enforced. The debate here should be how we enforce this agreement, not how we augment activities to further encourage the regime to avoid what it agreed to.

Iran remains a center of illicit procurement, anxious to find ways to circumvent U.S. export controls and sanctions. The nuclear deal acknowledged this in annex I, which states that Iran intends to apply nuclear export policies and practices in line with internationally established standards for the export of nuclear material, equipment, and technology.

Now, Iran has done absolutely nothing to implement this provision of the agreement, and the administration appears content to allow them to get out of doing so. That is what is concerning.

Finally, the components for the heavy water plant were illicitly procured. Essentially, the United States Government is buying pirated heavy water because the components for that heavy water plant were illicitly procured.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 5119, the No 2H2O from Iran Act.

It is now clear that a glaring side effect of the disastrous nuclear deal with Iran is that it incentivizes Iran to keep overproducing heavy water—a critical component in the production of weapons-grade plutonium. Because this administration sees no problem with creating a new U.S.-approved heavy water marketplace, it is, thereby, giving Iran a green light to continue overproducing. There should, instead, be serious consequences for Iran's overproduction of heavy water. Under the administration's logic, we are paying and rewarding Iran for being in violation of the nuclear agreement, and we are making it easier for them to have nuclear weapons in the future.

It is high time for this administration to admit to the American people and to itself that Iran has no intention of complying with the nuclear deal. We should not give them any more concessions that cost American taxpayers their hard-earned dollars while advancing Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to commend Mr. POMPEO and the chairman for their leadership on this issue, and I echo what the chairman said just a few moments ago.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 5119, the No 2H2O from Iran Act. This legislation would block the licensing and purchasing of heavy water—nuclear material that is needed for a nuclear weapon—from Iran.

The bill became necessary when the administration announced it intended to make an \$8.6 million purchase of 32 tons of this nuclear material despite the purchase not being required by the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Further, the administration never clarified how Iran would use such funds or if steps would be taken to ensure U.S. taxpayer dollars are not used by Iran to support terrorism, Iran's ballistic missile program, or to finance other nefarious activities or bad actors in the region.

The bill is necessary, unfortunately, because Iran is still producing heavy

water, and, now, to echo the chairman's sentiments, we are creating a market for it. That just doesn't make sense.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the chairman for his leadership. I think this is a very serious issue. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to my friend from Pennsylvania. There is no requirement under the agreement that Iran cannot manufacture heavy water. There is a limit on the amount that they can possess. That is why the reserves are in storage elsewhere. The amount that we are talking about now is already being shipped to the United States as we speak.

Iran has a right, under the agreement, to continue producing heavy water, which it will.

Where is the heavy water going to go?

They can sell it on the global market. I would rather they sell it to the United States at market price than to North Korea or to Pakistan or to some other actor.

This bill is misguided and misses the point. They are not violating the agreement. We are better off in having the heavy water that we need, that we don't produce, and that Canada has stopped producing that we will be able to reinforce the possibility of having a successful agreement over time.

I appreciate the ranking member for giving me the opportunity to at least clarify what I think is reality.

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

A clarifying point is that they cannot sell it to North Korea. Iran would not be able to do that because North Korea is under sanctions on just that point.

I would also just make the argument that there is no scientific or medical breakthrough that is dependent upon purchases of heavy water from Iran; and, if there were, I have no doubt that we could work with our ally, Canada, to make it happen because Canada, in particular, has been creating a reliable, long-term heavy water supply that is able to meet the projected increased needs in North America and elsewhere. Canada stopped producing more because they have too much, and they anticipated that we would purchase this from them. The United States should support our ally, Canada, in this effort rather than in subsidizing a state sponsor of terrorism's production of sensitive material.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I thank Mr. POMPEO for his work on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 5119, and I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation.

Here, on the anniversary of Mr. Obama's deal with the theocracy of Iran, passing the No 2H2O from Iran Act is a commonsense thing to do.

There is nothing in the failed, ill-conceived, misdirected, poorly designed disaster of a nuclear deal which says the United States Government is required to help Iran fulfill its commitments to limit its stores of heavy water. I remain unconvinced today by the arguments of my friends in the loyal opposition of the idea that our government would obligate our taxpayers or even possess an option to buy Iranian heavy water in the future. It is ridiculous. There is a private market for heavy water in this world, and the Iranians are welcome to meet their deal obligations in that private market. It is Iran's responsibility to comply with the limits of its heavy water agreement.

As to the nuclear deal, it is not the United States' or any other country's responsibility to buy a commodity in an already limited global market from a government that has done nothing to indicate that it is a friend.

I am proud to support this legislation, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support its passage.

I thank the chairman for his leadership consistently on analyzing the President's transaction with Iran and its shortcomings. Here, a year has passed, and we still see the failings of this transaction every time we turn.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the chairman. I really appreciate Chairman ROYCE for offering this legislation, and I thank MIKE POMPEO for all of his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, here is the deal. We were told by people like Ben Rhodes that the Iran agreement was going to capitalize on winds of change inside Iran and that this could be a way for Iran to cease its offending conduct and become part of the community of nations. Yet here we are, over a year out from this Iran deal, and Iran is increasing its illegal proliferation procurement activities. It is increasing its missile procurement activities. This is not the action of a country that is looking to make nice with the rest of the world. They are taking the concessions that were granted to them in this Iran deal, and they are taking advantage of them, and they are expanding their influence throughout the Middle East.

It is curious because the deal itself, I think, clearly, in looking back on it, has been a failure; but what the administration is doing is doubling down on that, and it is going even beyond what the deal says. It wants to give Iran indirect access to the American dollar. Then this purchasing of heavy water is not a requirement of the deal's. It, ef-

fectively, acts as a subsidy on Iran for Iran's nuclear program. We see other things like really lucrative aircraft deals that will help Iran transport weapons to its proxies in places like Syria and Lebanon.

Of course, there are reports about uranium being found in Parchin, one of the military sites. We are never going to be able to inspect Parchin. That is not even in the deal. That is totally off the table. Iran is not going to permit inspections there; so you could have some of this activity continuing apace there.

I think it is great that a majority of us in this House has been on the right side of this in voting against the Iran deal, in voting for a number of years to sustain very tough sanctions on Iran. And now this series of bills that we have, I think, is important, and particularly the heavy water issue, because it is an unnecessary illicit subsidy that we are sending over to Iran.

If you ask the American people whether they want their tax dollars going to subsidize Iran's nuclear program, you will have overwhelming opposition to such a policy; so I am happy to be here, speaking in favor of this and of the other measures.

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

In the summer of 2013, we passed a very tough sanctions bill against Iran. The chairman and I worked on it together very closely, and we passed it unanimously out of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Think about that—unanimously. We have so many different ranges of ideologies on the committee; yet, when it came to slapping sanctions on a murderous regime, we found bipartisan consensus unanimously. That bill went to the House floor and passed by a margin of 400-20. We sent it over to the Senate, and, unfortunately, the Senate sat on it. It didn't pass it.

I raise this because it shows what can happen when we work in a bipartisan fashion on important foreign policy issues. This is important. My friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle who came up and who spoke disparagingly about Iran and the Iranian Government will get no quarrel from me. I am no fan of the regime's and I am no fan of a lot of things, but I do think that if we are going to pass legislation that is going to have meaning, then we ought to do it together in a bipartisan form.

□ 1700

For the past 3½ years, Chairman ROYCE and myself have worked really, really hard to put our heads together and come up with bipartisan legislation, and this could have been the same. This could have been the same.

This could have come to the Foreign Affairs Committee. We would have debated it, and we would have passed it probably. There would have been some changes with some difficulties that some of us find in the bill, and perhaps we would have had a very similar vote. But it wasn't done that way.

No regular order. Taking the bill out of the Foreign Affairs Committee, where no one on the committee had a chance to either vote or speak on it or give their opinion—absolutely nothing. It was taken to the Rules Committee, rammed down, and came to the floor of the House. There was no process, no transparency, no regular order, no bipartisanship.

My God, if we cannot be bipartisan when it comes to foreign policy, what can we be bipartisan on? Here is a perfect example.

So what happens is this bill is going to pass. I predict it will pass, mostly along political lines. The President won't sign it. It won't probably pass the other House.

But maybe if we had put our heads together and all worked together and sent the bills to the Foreign Affairs Committee and came up with legislation, maybe we could have had a bill that did 80 percent of what this bill did, or maybe 90 percent, or maybe 100 percent but had certain things in there—waivers and other things that are necessary—in the bill. That is why I know that this is not a serious attempt at doing it. It is an amendment attempt to score political brownie points, and that is not what we should be all about, and that is not what we should be doing.

My friends on the other side of the aisle and on my side of the aisle know, when I talk about foreign policy, I try to be principled. We may not always agree, but I try to be principled on it. I try to say what I feel. I try to find common ground.

So I hope this will be an anomaly. I hope that we can go back to the bipartisan ways of the committee. I know tomorrow morning when we mark up all those bills we will be doing it in a bipartisan way and, when we come to legislation, the final product, that it is bipartisan. It is not being bipartisan for the sake of it being bipartisan. It is not just a semantical debate. It is the fact that it is good legislation on foreign policy, and we always say that partisanship should stop at the water's edge.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have gone on trips all over the world. We have bipartisan delegations all the time. And what we always find is, as Americans, when we go around the world, there is very little that divides us. There is very little that divides us.

When we were in the majority and I was chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee for 4 years, we went around to all these countries. Everyone on my committee on my trip, Democrat or Republican, had the ability to say whatever was on their mind and not once was there ever a problem because, as Americans, we have so much more in common than we have differences. And that is why, again, bipartisanship should stop at the water's edge.

I worry because the world is watching as American foreign policy falls

victim to partisan politics. And, tomorrow, unfortunately, with another bill, we are going to get more of the same.

So I hope that, in the future, we can get back to business as usual because I know that Congress can work to push back on Iran's dangerous behavior. I know that we can hold Iran's feet to the fire and make sure that the nuclear deal, which passed—again, without my vote, but it passed—and I want to make sure that that nuclear deal is being implemented properly.

That is what we have to do: hold Iran's feet to the fire, do it in a bipartisan way, not try to score political brownie points.

We all love this country. We want the right thing for this country. Let's work together to make sure that foreign policy is as bipartisan as it can be.

For now, I have to vote "no" on this bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have a concern with the administration's decision on this issue over Iran, not necessarily my colleagues here. My concern is that, regardless of how we perceive the Iran deal that we voted on on the floor, my concern is that the administration is now going beyond that deal. It is the administration's conduct here that gives me pause.

When I hear the Secretary of Energy for the President, Mr. Ernest Moniz, he made it clear that the U.S. purchase of this heavy water, in his words, "will be a statement to the world: 'You want to buy heavy water from Iran, you can buy heavy water from Iran. It's been done. Even the United States did it.'"

Why are we giving the seal of approval to Iran's heavy water production? Why is the administration doing that? This is beyond me. It is beyond many experts.

I previously quoted nonproliferation expert David Albright, who has said we shouldn't be paying Iran for something they shouldn't be producing in the first place.

With this policy of purchasing Iran's heavy water, the Obama administration is achieving two things. And neither of those two things, in my opinion, are good. It is legitimatizing Iran's nuclear program, and it is putting more money into Iran's pocket.

More buyers for Iran's heavy water means it will continue to produce this sensitive material. And in just 15 years, when the President's flawed nuclear deal expires, Iran can use this heavy water to produce weapons-grade plutonium.

The Obama administration's latest effort to go above and beyond to accommodate Iran should be rejected.

So I would urge all Members to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 819, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to recommit on S. 304; and passage of S. 304, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 176, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

YEAS—249

Abraham	Fincher	Lamborn
Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Lance
Allen	Fleischmann	Latta
Amash	Fleming	Lieu, Ted
Amodei	Flores	Lipinski
Ashford	Forbes	LoBiondo
Babin	Fortenberry	Long
Barletta	Fox	Love
Barr	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Barton	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Benishek	Garrett	Lummis
Bilirakis	Gibbs	MacArthur
Bishop (MI)	Gibson	Marchant
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Marino
Black	Goodlatte	Massie
Blackburn	Gosar	McCarthy
Blum	Gowdy	McCaul
Bost	Graham	McClintock
Boustany	Granger	McHenry
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	McKinley
Brat	Graves (LA)	McMorris
Bridenstine	Graves (MO)	Rodgers
Brooks (AL)	Green, Gene	McSally
Brooks (IN)	Griffith	Meadows
Buchanan	Grothman	Meehan
Buck	Guinta	Messer
Bucshon	Guthrie	Mica
Burgess	Hanna	Miller (FL)
Byrne	Hardy	Miller (MI)
Calvert	Harper	Moolenaar
Cárdenas	Harris	Mooney (WV)
Carter (GA)	Hartzler	Mullin
Carter (TX)	Heck (NV)	Mulvaney
Chabot	Hensarling	Murphy (PA)
Chaffetz	Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer
Clawson (FL)	Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse
Coffman	Hill	Noem
Cole	Holding	Nugent
Collins (GA)	Hudson	Nunes
Collins (NY)	Huelskamp	Olson
Comstock	Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo
Conaway	Hultgren	Palmer
Cook	Hunter	Paulsen
Costello (PA)	Hurd (TX)	Perry
Cramer	Hurt (VA)	Peterson
Crawford	Issa	Pittenger
Crenshaw	Jenkins (KS)	Pitts
Culberson	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Curbelo (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Pompeo
Davidson	Johnson, Sam	Posey
Davis, Rodney	Jolly	Price, Tom
Denham	Jordan	Ratcliffe
Dent	Joyce	Reed
DeSantis	Katko	Reichert
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Renacci
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Ribble
Dold	King (IA)	Rice (SC)
Donovan	King (NY)	Rigell
Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)	Roby
Duncan (SC)	Kline	Roe (TN)
Ellmers (NC)	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Emmer (MN)	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Farenthold	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher

Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Sessions
 Vargas
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin

Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

□ 1731

Mr. CARNEY and Mrs. BEATTY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas, VELA, and CÁRDENAS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 441, I was unavoidably detained outside the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 441, I was unavoidably detained outside the Chamber. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 441. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate concurs in the House amendments to the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 636) “An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.”

CONGRESSIONAL GOLF TOURNAMENT

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the results of a competition that takes place every year.

Every year, the House Republicans play against the House Democrats in a golf match that is patterned after the Ryder Cup. This is called the Congressional Cup.

This takes place once each year, and I have been privileged to serve as the captain of the Republican team for 4 years. I am pleased to announce with all the humility I can muster that the Republicans have won again for the fourth straight year.

The good news is that it is a fund-raising event that has raised nearly \$2 million for an organization called First Tee, which introduces young people to the game of golf.

The event this year raised a little less than \$100,000. As I said, over a 15-year period, we have raised over \$2 million.

This introduces young people to the game of golf; the principles of golf, like discipline, hard work, and commitment; and life skills to help those individuals.

So I want to congratulate the members of the team for another great win.

There was a lot of hard work, dedication, et cetera.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), my counterpart, the captain of the Democratic team.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding.

I am beginning to feel a little bit like “Groundhog Day.” Unfortunately, no matter what Bill Murray does, the result seems to be the same. We keep changing team members, strategies, and so forth, but it hasn’t mattered.

My congratulations to the Republican team. They played extremely well. We will keep trying.

The most important thing, as my colleague said, is the incredible sums of money we raise to help a phenomenal program like First Tee. Most everybody in this body has a First Tee chapter in their district. I know I don’t need to talk about the great benefit it provides to American youth.

So, once again, congratulations to the Republican team.

My final comment would be to say it has been an honor and a pleasure to co-captain this event with my good friend, ANDER CRENSHAW. This will be his last year as captain. I will miss him, but he has comported himself in every instance with the class and grace you would expect of an avid golfer, as have the members of both teams.

Once again, congratulations to the Republicans. We will see you again next year.

CONSCIENCE PROTECTION ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 244, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—182

Adams	Brady (PA)	Chu, Judy
Aguilar	Brown (FL)	Cicilline
Ashford	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Bass	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Butterfield	Clay
Becerra	Capps	Cleaver
Bera	Capuano	Clyburn
Beyer	Cárdenas	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Connolly
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Conyers
Bonamici	Cartwright	Cooper
Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)	Costa
F.	Castro (TX)	Courtney

NAYS—176

Adams
 Aguilar
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duckworth
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Foster

Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Loebsock
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowe
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)

Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O’Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Veasey
 Velázquez
 Vislosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Davis, Danny
 Hastings
 Knight

Takai
 Pearce
 Young (IN)
 Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Crowley Kennedy
 Cuellar Kildee
 Cummings Kilmer
 Davis (CA) Kind
 DeFazio Kirkpatrick
 DeGette Kuster
 Delaney Langevin
 DeLauro Larsen (WA)
 DelBene Larson (CT)
 DeSaulnier Lawrence
 Deutch Lee
 Dingell Levin
 Doggett Lewis
 Doyle, Michael F. Lieu, Ted
 Loebbeck
 Duckworth Lofgren
 Edwards Lowenthal
 Ellison Lowey
 Engel Lujan Grisham
 Eshoo (NM)
 Esty Luján, Ben Ray
 Farr (NM)
 Foster Lynch
 Frankel (FL) Maloney,
 Fudge Carolyn
 Gabbard Maloney, Sean
 Gallego Matsui
 Garamendi McCollum
 Graham McDermott
 Grayson McGovern
 Green, Al McNerney
 Green, Gene Meeks
 Grijalva Meng
 Gutiérrez Moore
 Hahn Moulton
 Heck (WA) Murphy (FL)
 Higgins Nadler
 Himes Napolitano
 Hinojosa Neal
 Honda Nolan
 Hoyer Norcross
 Huffman O'Rourke
 Israel Pallone
 Jackson Lee Pascrell
 Jeffries Payne
 Johnson (GA) Pelosi
 Johnson, E. B. Perlmutter
 Kaptur Peters
 Keating Pingree
 Kelly (IL) Pocan

NAYS—244

Abraham Davidson
 Aderholt Denham
 Allen Dent
 Amash DeSantis
 Amodei DesJarlais
 Babin Diaz-Balart
 Barletta Dold
 Barr Donovan
 Barton Duffy
 Benishek Duncan (SC)
 Bilirakis Duncan (TN)
 Bishop (MI) Ellmers (NC)
 Bishop (UT) Emmer (MN)
 Black Farenthold
 Blackburn Fincher
 Blum Fitzpatrick
 Bost Fleischmann
 Boustany Fleming
 Brady (TX) Flores
 Brat Forbes
 Bridenstine Fortenberry
 Brooks (AL) Foxx
 Brooks (IN) Frelinghuysen
 Buchanan Garrett
 Buck Gibbs
 Bucshon Gibson
 Burgess Gohmert
 Byrne Goodlatte
 Calvert Gosar
 Carter (GA) Gowdy
 Carter (TX) Granger
 Chabot Graves (GA)
 Chaffetz Graves (LA)
 Clawson (FL) Graves (MO)
 Coffman Griffith
 Cole Grothman
 Collins (GA) Guinta
 Collins (NY) Guthrie
 Comstock Hanna
 Conaway Hardy
 Cook Harper
 Costello (PA) Harris
 Crawford Hartzler
 Crenshaw Heck (NV)
 Culberson Hensarling
 Curbelo (FL) Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.

Polis Price (NC)
 Quigley Rangel
 Rice (NY) Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruffersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta Sarbanes
 Schakowsky Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Perry
 Peterson
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poliquin
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reed

NOT VOTING—7
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 Franks (AZ)
 Hastings
 Pearce
 Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1741

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:
 Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 442, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 182, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]
 YEAS—245

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costello (PA)
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Curbelo (FL)

Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rostenkowski
 Royce
 Russell
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Garrett
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 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)

NAYS—182

Adams
 Aguilar
 Ashford
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Farr
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanna
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin

Lewis	O'Rourke	Serrano
Lieu, Ted	Pallone	Sewell (AL)
Loeb	Pascarell	Sherman
Lofgren	Payne	Sinema
Lowenthal	Pelosi	Sires
Lowey	Perlmutter	Slaughter
Lujan Grisham	Peters	Smith (WA)
(NM)	Pingree	Speier
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)
(NM)	Polis	Takano
Lynch	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Maloney,	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Carolyn	Rangel	Titus
Maloney, Sean	Rice (NY)	Tonko
Matsui	Richmond	Torres
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
McDermott	Ruiz	Van Hollen
McGovern	Ruppersberger	Vargas
McNerney	Rush	Veasey
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Vela
Meng	Sánchez, Linda	Velázquez
Moore	T.	Visclosky
Moulton	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz
Murphy (FL)	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Nadler	Schakowsky	Schultz
Napolitano	Schiff	Waters, Maxine
Neal	Schrader	Watson Coleman
Nolan	Scott (VA)	Welch
Norcross	Scott, David	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Hastings	Poe (TX)	Takai
Pearce	Russell	Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1748

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. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 443, on the passage of S. 304, I am not recorded because I am representing constituents in business outside of Washington, DC. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5588. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 2016, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3055. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a dental insurance plan to veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 820 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. 5538.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1750

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. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, 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, amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-683 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 45 by Mr. BOUSTANY of Louisiana.

Amendment No. 50 by Mr. BYRNE of Alabama.

Amendment No. 57 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

Amendment No. 63 by Ms. GRAHAM of Florida.

Amendment No. 64 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 67 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 68 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 72 by Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

Amendment No. 73 by Mr. NEWHOUSE of Washington.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. BOUSTANY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) 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 234, noes 195, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

AYES—234

Abraham	Amodei	Barr
Aderholt	Ashford	Barton
Allen	Babin	Benishkek
Amash	Barletta	Bilirakis

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

NOES—195

Adams	Cartwright	DeGette
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Delaney
Bass	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Beatty	Chu, Judy	DelBene
Becerra	Ciциlline	DeSaulnier
Bera	Clark (MA)	Deutch
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Diaz-Balart
Blumenauer	Clawson (FL)	Dingell
Bonamici	Clay	Doggett
Boyle, Brendan	Cleaver	Dold
F.	Clyburn	Doyle, Michael
Brady (PA)	Cohen	F.
Brown (FL)	Connolly	Duckworth
Brownley (CA)	Conyers	Edwards
Buchanan	Cooper	Ellison
Bustos	Courtney	Engel
Butterfield	Crowley	Eshoo
Capps	Cummings	Esty
Capuano	Curbelo (FL)	Farr
Cárdenas	Davis (CA)	Fitzpatrick
Carney	Davis, Danny	Foster
Carson (IN)	DeFazio	Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren

NOT VOTING—4

Hastings
Pearce

Poe (TX)
Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1753

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes 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 237, noes 189,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

AYES—237

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodi
Babin
Barletta
Barr

Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Bost

Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck

Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Sanford
Sarbanes
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
MERCHANT
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
Forbes
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp

NOES—189

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Beckerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenaer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)

Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
MERCHANT
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp

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
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Blackburn
Cleaver
Hastings

Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Kennedy
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Velas
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)

NOT VOTING—7

Pearce
Poe (TX)
Russell

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1756

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD-
LATTE) 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 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 231, noes 197,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

AYES—231

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodi
Babin
Barletta
Barr

Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)

Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman

Cole	Johnson, Sam	Ribble	Joyce	Meeks	Sarbanes	Dingell	Lee	Quigley
Collins (GA)	Jolly	Rice (SC)	Kaptur	Meng	Schakowsky	Doggett	Levin	Rangel
Collins (NY)	Jones	Roby	Keating	Miller (MI)	Schiff	Donovan	Lewis	Reichert
Conaway	Jordan	Roe (TN)	Kelly (IL)	Moore	Scott (VA)	Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Rice (NY)
Cook	Katko	Rogers (AL)	Kennedy	Moulton	Scott, David	F.	LoBiondo	Richmond
Costello (PA)	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)	Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Serrano	Duckworth	Loeb sack	Ros-Lehtinen
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher	Kilmer	Nadler	Sewell (AL)	Edwards	Lofgren	Royal-Allard
Crawford	King (IA)	Rokita	Kind	Napolitano	Sherman	Ellison	Lowenthal	Ruiz
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Rooney (FL)	Kirkpatrick	Neal	Sinema	Engel	Lowe y	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam	Kuster	Nolan	Sinema	Eshoo	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (OH)
Culberson	Kline	Ross	Langevin	Norcross	Slaughter	Esty	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda
Davidson	Knight	Rothfus	Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Smith (NJ)	Farr	Luján, Ben Ray	T.
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Rouzer	Larson (CT)	Pallone	Smith (WA)	Foster	(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta
Denham	LaHood	Royce	Lawrence	Pascrell	Speier	Frankel (FL)	Lynch	Sanford
Dent	LaMalfa	Russell	Lee	Paulsen	Swalwell (CA)	Fudge	Maloney,	Sarbanes
DeSantis	Lamborn	Salmon	Levin	Payne	Takano	Gabbard	Carolyn	Schakowsky
DesJarlais	Lance	Sanford	Lewis	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)	Gallego	Maloney, Sean	Schiff
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Scalise	Lieu, Ted	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)	Garamendi	Matsui	Schrader
Donovan	Long	Schrad er	Lipinski	Peters	Titus	Garrett	McCollum	Scott (VA)
Duffy	Loudermilk	Schweikert	LoBiondo	Pingree	Tonko	Graham	McDermott	Scott, David
Duncan (SC)	Love	Scott, Austin	Loeb sack	Pocan	Torres	Grayson	McGovern	Serrano
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Sensenbrenner	Lofgren	Polis	Tsongas	Gutiérrez	McNerney	Sherman
Ellmers (NC)	Luetkemeyer	Sessions	Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Van Hollen	Hahn	Meeks	Sires
Emmer (MN)	Lummis	Shimkus	Lowe y	Quigley	Vargas	Heck (WA)	Meng	Slaughter
Farenthold	MacArthur	Shuster	Lujan Grisham	Rangel	Veasey	Higgins	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Fincher	Marchant	Simpson	(NM)	Rice (NY)	Vela	Himes	Moore	Smith (WA)
Fleischmann	Marino	Smith (MO)	Luján, Ben Ray	Richmond	Velázquez	Honda	Moulton	Speier
Fleming	Massie	Smith (NE)	(NM)	Rigell	Visclosky	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
Flores	McCarthy	Smith (TX)	Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen	Walz	Huffman	Nadler	Takano
Fortenberry	McCaul	Stefanik	Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman	Israel	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Fox	McClintock	Stewart	Carolyn	Ruiz	Schultz	Jeffries	Neal	Thompson (MS)
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Stivers	Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Waters, Maxine	Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Titus
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Stutzman	Matsui	Rush	Watson Coleman	Jolly	Norcross	Tonko
Garrett	McMorris	Thompson (PA)	McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Welch	Jones	Nugent	Torres
Gibbs	Rodgers	Thornberry	McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)	Kaptur	Pallone	Tsongas
Gohmert	McSally	Tiberi	McGovern	T.	Wittman	Keating	Pascrell	Turner
Goodlatte	Meadows	Tipton	McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth	Kelly (IL)	Paulsen	Van Hollen
Gosar	Meehan	Trott				Kennedy	Payne	Vargas
Gowdy	Messer	Turner				Kilmer	Pelosi	Velázquez
Granger	Mica	Upton	Graves (LA)	Pearce	Takai	Kind	Perlmutter	Visclosky
Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Valadao	Hastings	Poe (TX)		Kirkpatrick	Peters	Wasserman
Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Wagner				Kuster	Pingree	Schultz
Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Walberg				Langevin	Pocan	Watson Coleman
Grothman	Mullin	Walden				Larsen (WA)	Poliquin	Welch
Guinta	Mulvaney	Walker				Larson (CT)	Polis	Wilson (FL)
Guthrie	Murphy (PA)	Walorski				Lawrence	Posey	Yarmuth
Hardy	Neugebauer	Walters, Mimi					Price (NC)	Yoho
Harper	Newhouse	Weber (TX)						
Hartzler	Noem	Webster (FL)						
Heck (NV)	Nugent	Wenstrup						
Hensarling	Nunes	Westerman						
Herrera Beutler	Olson	Westmoreland						
Hice, Jody B.	Palazzo	Whitfield						
Hill	Palmer	Williams						
Holding	Perry	Wilson (SC)						
Hudson	Peterson	Womack						
Huelskamp	Pittenger	Woodall						
Huizenga (MI)	Pitts	Yoder						
Hultgren	Poliquin	Yoho						
Hunter	Pompeo	Young (AK)						
Hurd (TX)	Posey	Young (IA)						
Hurt (VA)	Price, Tom	Young (IN)						
Issa	Ratcliffe	Zeldin						
Jenkins (KS)	Reed	Zinke						
Jenkins (WV)	Reichert							
Johnson (OH)	Renacci							

NOT VOTING—5

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1800

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MS. GRAHAM
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GRA-
HAM) 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 185, noes 243,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

AYES—185

Adams	Clyburn	Farr	Butterfield	Connolly	Abraham	Denham	Hudson
Aguilar	Cohen	Fitzpatrick	Capps	Conyers	Aderholt	Dent	Huelskamp
Bass	Comstock	Forbes	Capuano	Courtney	Allen	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)
Beatty	Connolly	Foster	Becerra	Crenshaw	Amash	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Becerra	Conyers	Frankel (FL)	Beyer	Cummings	Amodei	Dold	Hunter
Bera	Cooper	Fudge	Bilirakis	Curbelo (FL)	Ashford	Duffy	Hurd (TX)
Beyer	Costa	Gabbard	Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Babin	Duncan (SC)	Hurt (VA)
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Gallego	Bishop (UT)	Davis, Danny	Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Blumenauer	Crowley	Garamendi	Black	DeFazio	Barr	Ellmers (NC)	Jackson Lee
Bonamici	Cummings	Gibson	Blackburn	DeGette	Barton	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (KS)
Boyle, Brendan	Curbelo (FL)	Graham	Blum	Delaney	Bass	Farenthold	Jenkins (WV)
F.	Davis (CA)	Grayson	Bost	DeLauro	Benishek	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Green, Al	Boustany	Delaware	Bishop (MI)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Green, Gene	Brady (TX)	Delaney	Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Grijalva	Brat	DeLauro	Black	Fleming	Jordan
Bustos	Delaney	Gutiérrez	Bridenstine	DeLauro	Blackburn	Flores	Joyce
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hahn	Brooks (AL)	DeBene	Blum	Forbes	Katko
Capps	DelBene	Hanna	Brooks (IN)	DeFazio	Bost	Fortenberry	Kelly (MS)
Capuano	DeSaulnier	Harris	Buck	DeGette	Boustan y	Fox	Kelly (PA)
Cárdenas	Deutch	Heck (WA)	Bucshon	Delaney	Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Carney	Dingell	Higgins	Burgess	Delaney	Brat	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Himes	Byrne	Delaney	Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger (IL)
Cartwright	Dold	Hinojosa	Calvert	Delaney	Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	Kline
Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael	Honda	Carney	Delaney	Brooks (IN)	Gibson	Knight
Castro (TX)	F.	Hoyer	Carter (GA)	Delaney	Buck	Gohmert	Labrador
Chu, Judy	Duckworth	Huffman	Carter (TX)	Delaney	Bucshon	Goodlatte	Labrador
Ciçilline	Edwards	Israel	Chabot	Delaney	Burgess	Gosar	LaHood
Clark (MA)	Ellison	Jackson Lee	Chaffetz	Delaney	Byrne	Gowdy	LaMalfa
Clarke (NY)	Engel	Jeffries	Coffman	Delaney	Carney	Granger	Lamborn
Clay	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)	Cole	Delaney	Carney	Graves (GA)	Lance
Cleaver	Esty	Johnson, E. B.	Coffman	Delaney	Carney	Graves (LA)	Latta
			Cole	Delaney	Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
			Cohen	Deutch	Carter (TX)	Green, Al	Long
					Chabot	Green, Gene	Loudermilk
					Chaffetz	Griffith	Love
					Coffman	Grijalva	Lucas
					Cole	Grothman	Luetkemeyer
					Collins (GA)	Guinta	Lummis
					Collins (NY)	Guthrie	MacArthur
					Comstock	Hanna	Marchant
					Conaway	Hardy	Marino
					Cook	Harper	Massie
					Cooper	Harris	McCarthy
					Costa	Hartzler	McCaul
					Costello (PA)	Heck (NV)	McClintock
					Cramer	Hensarling	McHenry
					Crawford	Herrera Beutler	McKinley
					Cuellar	Hice, Jody B.	McMorris
					Culberson	Hill	Rodgers
					Davidson	Hinojosa	McSally
					Davis, Rodney	Holding	Meadows

Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Tipton	Gohmert	Marino	Rokita	Nadler	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Messer	Rohrabacher	Trott	Goodlatte	Massie	Rooney (FL)	Napolitano	Rush	Tiberi
Mica	Rokita	Upton	Gosar	McCarthy	Ross	Neal	Ryan (OH)	Titus
Miller (MI)	Rooney (FL)	Valadao	Gowdy	McClintock	Rothfus	Nolan	Sánchez, Linda	Tonko
Moolenaar	Roskam	Veasey	Granger	McHenry	Rouzer	Norcross	T.	Torres
Mooney (WV)	Ross	Vela	Graves (GA)	McMorris	Royce	O'Rourke	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
Mullin	Rothfus	Wagner	Graves (LA)	Rodgers	Russell	Pallone	Sarbanes	Turner
Mulvaney	Rouzer	Walberg	Griffith	McSally	Salmon	Pascrell	Schakowsky	Upton
Murphy (PA)	Royce	Walden	Grothman	Meadows	Sanford	Payne	Schiff	Valadao
Neugebauer	Rush	Walker	Guinta	Messer	Scalise	Pelosi	Schrader	Van Hollen
Newhouse	Russell	Walorski	Guthrie	Mica	Schweikert	Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Noem	Salmon	Walters, Mimi	Harper	Miller (FL)	Scott, Austin	Peters	Scott, David	Veasey
Nunes	Scalise	Walz	Harris	Miller (MI)	Sensenbrenner	Peterson	Serrano	Vela
O'Rourke	Schweikert	Waters, Maxine	Hartzler	Moorenaar	Sessions	Pingree	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Olson	Scott, Austin	Weber (TX)	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)	Simpson	Pocan	Sherman	Vislousky
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Wenstrup	Herrera Beutler	Mullin	Smith (MO)	Polis	Shimkus	Walden
Palmer	Sessions	Westerman	Hice, Jody B.	Hill	Smith (NE)	Price (NC)	Shuster	Walz
Perry	Sewell (AL)	Westmoreland	Holding	Mulvaney	Smith (TX)	Quigley	Sinema	Wasserman
Peterson	Shimkus	Whitfield	Hudson	Neugebauer	Stewart	Rangel	Sires	Schultz
Pittenger	Shuster	Williams	Huelskamp	Newhouse	Stutzman	Reed	Slaughter	Waters, Maxine
Pitts	Simpson	Wilson (SC)	Huizenga (MI)	Noem	Thompson (PA)	Reichert	Smith (NJ)	Watson Coleman
Pompeo	Sinema	Wittman	Hurd (TX)	Nugent	Thornberry	Renacci	Smith (WA)	Welch
Price, Tom	Smith (MO)	Womack	Hurt (VA)	Nunes	Tipton	Rice (NY)	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Ratcliffe	Smith (NE)	Woodall	Issa	Olson	Trott	Richmond	Stefanik	Yarmuth
Reed	Smith (TX)	Yoder	Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo	Wagner	Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers	Young (AK)
Renacci	Stefanik	Young (AK)	Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Walberg	Roskam	Swalwell (CA)	Zeldin
Ribble	Stewart	Young (IA)	Jones	Paulsen	Walker	Roybal-Allard	Takano	Zinke
Rice (SC)	Stivers	Young (IN)	Jordan	Perry	Walorski	Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	
Rigell	Stutzman	Zeldin	Kelly (MS)	Pitts	Walters, Mimi			
Roby	Thompson (PA)	Zinke	Kline	Poliquin	Weber (TX)			
Roe (TN)	Thornberry		Knight	Pompeo	Western			
Rogers (AL)	Tiberi		Labrador	Posey	Westmoreland			

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings	Poe (TX)	Webster (FL)
Pearce	Takai	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1802

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) 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 188, noes 238, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 448]

AYES—188

Abraham	Brooks (IN)	Culberson
Aderholt	Buchanan	Davidson
Allen	Buck	Dent
Amash	Burgess	DeSantis
Amodei	Byrne	DesJarlais
Babin	Calvert	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Carter (TX)	Ellmers (NC)
Benishek	Chabot	Farenthold
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Fincher
Bishop (MI)	Clawson (FL)	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Fleming
Black	Cole	Flores
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Forbes
Blum	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Boustany	Comstock	Fox
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Brat	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Bridenstine	Crawford	Garrett
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Gibbs

NOES—238

Adams	DelBene	Johnson, E. B.
Aguilar	Denham	Jolly
Ashford	DeSaulnier	Joyce
Barletta	Deutch	Kaptur
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Katko
Beatty	Dingell	Keating
Becerra	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Bera	Dold	Kelly (PA)
Beyer	Donovan	Kennedy
Bishop (GA)	Doyle, Michael	Kildee
Blumenauer	F.	Kilmer
Bonamici	Duckworth	Kind
Bost	Duffy	King (NY)
Boyle, Brendan	Edwards	Kinzinger (IL)
F.	Ellison	Kirkpatrick
Brady (PA)	Emmer (MN)	Kuster
Brown (FL)	Engel	LaHood
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Lance
Bucshon	Esty	Langevin
Bustos	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)
Capps	Foster	Lawrence
Capuano	Frankel (FL)	Lee
Carney	Fudge	Levin
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lewis
Cartwright	Gallego	Lieu, Ted
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Lipinski
Castro (TX)	Gibson	LoBiondo
Chu, Judy	Graham	Loeb
Ciavarella	Graves (MO)	Loeb
Clark (MA)	Grayson	Lofgren
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Clay	Green, Gene	Lowe
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lujan Grisham
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	(NM)
Cohen	Hahn	Luján, Ben Ray
Connolly	Hanna	(NM)
Conyers	Hardy	Lynch
Cook	Heck (NV)	MacArthur
Cooper	Heck (WA)	Maloney,
Costa	Higgins	Carolyn
Costello (PA)	Himes	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Hinojosa	Matsui
Crowley	Honda	McCollum
Cuellar	Hoyer	McDermott
Cummings	Huffman	McGovern
Curbelo (FL)	Hultgren	McKinley
Davis (CA)	Hunter	McNerney
Davis, Danny	Israel	Meehan
Davis, Rodney	Jackson Lee	Meeks
DeFazio	Jeffries	Meng
DeGette	Jenkins (WV)	Moore
Delaney	Johnson (GA)	Moulton
DeLauro	Johnson (OH)	Murphy (FL)
		Murphy (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

NOT VOTING—7

Cárdenas	Pearce	Webster (FL)
Hastings	Poe (TX)	
Marchant	Takai	

□ 1805

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) 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 238, noes 190, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 449]

AYES—238

Abraham	Bucshon	Dent
Aderholt	Burgess	DeSantis
Allen	Byrne	DesJarlais
Amash	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Dold
Ashford	Carter (TX)	Donovan
Babin	Chabot	Duffy
Barletta	Chaffetz	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Coffman	Ellmers (NC)
Benishek	Cole	Emmer (MN)
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Bishop (MI)	Collins (NY)	Fincher
Bishop (UT)	Comstock	Fleischmann
Black	Conaway	Fleming
Blackburn	Cook	Flores
Blum	Costa	Forbes
Boustany	Cramer	Fortenberry
Brady (TX)	Crawford	Fox
Brat	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Bridenstine	Cuellar	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Garrett
Brooks (IN)	Davidson	Gibbs
Buck	Davis, Rodney	Gibson
	Denham	Gohmert

Goodlatte	MacArthur	Rothfus	Meeks	Rice (NY)	Smith (WA)	Holding	Meadows	Schweikert
Gosar	Marchant	Rouzer	Meng	Richmond	Speier	Hudson	Messer	Scott, Austin
Gowdy	Marino	Royce	Moore	Ros-Lehtinen	Swalwell (CA)	Huelskamp	Mica	Sensenbrenner
Granger	Massie	Russell	Moulton	Royal-Allard	Takano	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)	Sessions
Graves (GA)	McCarthy	Salmon	Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	Hultgren	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Graves (LA)	McCaul	Sanford	Nadler	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	Hunter	Moolenaar	Shuster
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Scalise	Napolitano	Rush	Titus	Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Simpson
Griffith	McHenry	Schweikert	Neal	Ryan (OH)	Tonko	Jenkins (KS)	Mullin	Smith (MO)
Grothman	McKinley	Scott, Austin	Nolan	Sánchez, Linda	Torres	Jenkins (WV)	Mulvaney	Smith (NE)
Guinta	McMorris	Sensenbrenner	Norcross	T.	Tsongas	Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Smith (TX)
Guthrie	Rodgers	Sessions	O'Rourke	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen	Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Stefanik
Hardy	McSally	Shimkus	Pallone	Sarbanes	Walz	Jolly	Newhouse	Stewart
Harper	Meadows	Shuster	Pascarell	Schakowsky	Vargas	Jones	Noem	Stivers
Harris	Meehan	Simpson	Payne	Schiff	Veasey	Jordan	Nugent	Stutzman
Hartzler	Messer	Smith (MO)	Pelosi	Schrader	Velázquez	Joyce	Nunes	Thompson (PA)
Heck (NV)	Mica	Smith (NE)	Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Visclosky	Kaptur	Olson	Thornberry
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Peters	Scott, David	Walz	Katko	Palazzo	Tiberi
Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Stefanik	Pingree	Serrano	Wasserman	Kelly (MS)	Palmer	Tiberti
Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar	Stewart	Pocan	Sewell (AL)	Schultz	Kelly (PA)	Perry	Tipton
Hill	Mooney (WV)	Stivers	Polis	Sherman	Waters, Maxine	King (IA)	Peterson	Trott
Holding	Mullin	Stutzman	Price (NC)	Sinema	Watson Coleman	King (NY)	Pittenger	Turner
Hudson	Mulvaney	Thompson (PA)	Quigley	Slaughter	Welch	Kinzinger (IL)	Pitts	Upton
Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)	Thornberry	Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (FL)	Kline	Poliquin	Valadao
Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer	Tiberi	Reichert		Yarmuth	Knight	Pompeo	Walbridge
Hultgren	Newhouse	Tipton				Labrador	Posey	Walberg
Hunter	Noem	Trott				LaHood	Price, Tom	Walden
Hurd (TX)	Nugent	Turner	Hastings	Pearce	Takai	LaMalfa	Ratcliffe	Walker
Hurt (VA)	Nunes	Upton	Issa	Poe (TX)		Lamborn	Reed	Walorski
Jenkins (KS)	Olson	Valadao				Lance	Renacci	Walters, Mimi
Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo	Vela				Latta	Ribble	Weber (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Wagner				Long	Rice (SC)	Webster (FL)
Johnson, Sam	Paulsen	Walberg				Loudermilk	Rigell	Wenstrup
Jolly	Perry	Walden				Love	Roby	Westerman
Jones	Peterson	Walker				Lucas	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
Jordan	Pittenger	Walorski				Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Williams
Joyce	Pitts	Walters, Mimi				Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Kelly (MS)	Poliquin	Weber (TX)				Marchant	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Kelly (PA)	Pompeo	Webster (FL)				Marino	Rokita	Womack
King (IA)	Posey	Wenstrup				Massie	Rooney (FL)	Woodall
King (NY)	Price, Tom	Westerman				McCarthy	Roskam	Yoder
Kinzinger (IL)	Ratcliffe	Westmoreland				McCaul	Ross	Yoho
Kline	Reed	Whitfield				McClintock	Rothfus	Young (AK)
Knight	Renacci	Williams				McHenry	Rouzer	Young (IA)
Labrador	Ribble	Wilson (SC)				McKinley	Royce	Young (IN)
LaHood	Rice (SC)	Wittman				McMorris	Russell	Zeldin
LaMalfa	Rigell	Womack				Rodgers	Salmon	Zinke
Lamborn	Roby	Woodall				McSally	Scalise	
Lance	Roe (TN)	Yoder						
Latta	Rogers (AL)	Yoho						
Long	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)						
Loudermilk	Rohrabacher	Young (IA)						
Love	Rokita	Young (IN)						
Lucas	Rooney (FL)	Zeldin						
Luetkemeyer	Roskam	Zinke						
Lummis	Ross							

NOES—190

Adams	Davis (CA)	Israel
Aguilar	Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee
Bass	DeFazio	Jeffries
Beatty	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Becerra	Delaney	Johnson, E. B.
Bera	DeLauro	Kaptur
Beyer	DelBene	Katko
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Keating
Blumenauer	Deuch	Kelly (IL)
Bonamici	Dingell	Kennedy
Boyle, Brendan	Doggett	Kildee
F.	Doyle, Michael	Kilmer
Brady (PA)	F.	Kind
Brown (FL)	Duckworth	Kirkpatrick
Brownley (CA)	Edwards	Kuster
Buchanan	Ellison	Langevin
Bustos	Engel	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
Capps	Esty	Lawrence
Capuano	Farr	Lee
Cárdenas	Fitzpatrick	Levin
Carney	Foster	Lewis
Carson (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Lieu, Ted
Cartwright	Fudge	Lipinski
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	LoBiondo
Castro (TX)	Gallego	Loebsack
Chu, Judy	Garamendi	Lofgren
Cicilline	Graham	Lowenthal
Clark (MA)	Grayson	Lowe
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham
Clay	Green, Gene	(NM)
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lujan, Ben Ray
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	(NM)
Cohen	Hahn	Lynch
Connolly	Hanna	Maloney,
Conyers	Heck (WA)	Carolyn
Cooper	Higgins	Maloney, Sean
Costello (PA)	Himes	Matsui
Courtney	Hinojosa	McCollum
Crowley	Honda	McDermott
Cummings	Hoyer	McGovern
Curbelo (FL)	Huffman	McNerney

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings	Pearce	Takai
Issa	Poe (TX)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1809

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAM-
BORN) 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 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 228, noes 199,
not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

AYES—228

Abraham	Chabot	Fleming	Adams	DeLauro	Kirkpatrick
Aderholt	Chaffetz	Flores	Aguilar	DelBene	Kuster
Allen	Clawson (FL)	Forbes	Ashford	DeSaulnier	Langevin
Amash	Coffman	Fox	Bass	Deuch	Larsen (WA)
Amodei	Cole	Franks (AZ)	Beatty	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Babin	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Becerra	Doggett	Lawrence
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Garrett	Bera	Dold	Lee
Barr	Comstock	Gibbs	Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Levin
Barton	Conaway	Gibson	Bishop (GA)	F.	Lewis
Benishek	Cook	Gohmert	Blumenauer	Duckworth	Lieu, Ted
Bilirakis	Cramer	Goodlatte	Bonamici	Edwards	Lipinski
Bishop (MI)	Crawford	Gosar	Boyle, Brendan	Engel	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gowdy	F.	Engel	Loebsack
Black	Culberson	Granger	Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Lofgren
Blackburn	Davidson	Graves (GA)	Brown (FL)	Esty	Lowenthal
Blum	Davis, Rodney	Graves (LA)	Brownley (CA)	Farr	Lujan Grisham
Bost	Denham	Graves (MO)	Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	(NM)
Boustany	Dent	Griffith	Bustos	Fortenberry	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brady (TX)	DeSantis	Grothman	Butterfield	Foster	(NM)
Brat	DesJarlais	Guinta	Capps	Frankel (FL)	
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Guthrie	Capuano	Fudge	Lynch
Brooks (AL)	Donovan	Hardy	Cárdenas	Gabbard	MacArthur
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Harper	Carney	Gallego	Maloney,
Buck	Duncan (SC)	Harris	Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Carolyn
Bucshon	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler	Cartwright	Graham	Maloney, Sean
Burgess	Ellmers (NC)	Heck (NV)	Castor (FL)	Grayson	Matsui
Byrne	Emmer (MN)	Hensarling	Castro (TX)	Green, Al	McCollum
Calvert	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler	Chu, Judy	Green, Gene	McDermott
Carter (GA)	Fincher	Hice, Jody B.	Cicilline	Grijalva	McGovern
Carter (TX)	Fleischmann	Hill	Clark (MA)	Gutiérrez	McNerney
			Clarke (NY)	Hahn	Meehan
			Clay	Hanna	Meeks
			Cleaver	Heck (WA)	Meng
			Clyburn	Higgins	Moore
			Cohen	Himes	Moulton
			Connolly	Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)
			Conyers	Honda	Nadler
			Cooper	Hoyer	Napolitano
			Costa	Huffman	Neal
			Costello (PA)	Israel	Nolan
			Courtney	Jackson Lee	Norcross
			Crowley	Jeffries	O'Rourke
			Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
			Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
			Curbelo (FL)	Keating	Paulsen
			Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Payne
			Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Pelosi
			DeFazio	Kildee	Perlmutter
			DeGette	Kilmer	Peters
			Delaney	Kind	Pingree

NOES—199

Adams	DeLauro	Kirkpatrick
Aguilar	DelBene	Kuster
Ashford	DeSaulnier	Langevin
Bass	Deuch	Larsen (WA)
Beatty	Dingell	Larson (CT)
Becerra	Doggett	Lawrence
Bera	Dold	Lee
Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Levin
Bishop (GA)	F.	Lewis
Blumenauer	Duckworth	Lieu, Ted
Bonamici	Edwards	Lipinski
Boyle, Brendan	Ellison	LoBiondo
F.	Engel	Loebsack
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Lofgren
Brown (FL)	Esty	Lowenthal
Brownley (CA)	Farr	Lowe
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Lujan Grisham
Bustos	Fortenberry	(NM)
Butterfield	Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray
Capps	Frankel (FL)	(NM)
Capuano	Fudge	Lynch
Cárdenas	Gabbard	MacArthur
Carney	Gallego	Maloney,
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Carolyn
Cartwright	Graham	Maloney, Sean
Castor (FL)	Grayson	Matsui
Castro (TX)	Green, Al	McCollum
Chu, Judy	Green, Gene	McDermott
Cicilline	Grijalva	McGovern
Clark (MA)	Gutiérrez	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Hahn	Meehan
Clay	Hanna	Meeks
Cleaver	Heck (WA)	Meng
Clyburn	Higgins	Moore
Cohen	Himes	Moulton
Connolly	Hinojosa	Murphy (FL)
Conyers	Honda	Nadler
Cooper	Hoyer	Napolitano
Costa	Huffman	Neal
Costello (PA)	Israel	Nolan
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Norcross
Crowley	Jeffries	O'Rourke
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Curbelo (FL)	Keating	Paulsen
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Payne
Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Pelosi
DeFazio	Kildee	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kilmer	Peters
Delaney	Kind	Pingree

Pocan Schakowsky Tonko
 Polis Schiff Torres
 Price (NC) Schrader Tsongas
 Quigley Scott (VA)
 Rangel Scott, David
 Reichert Serrano
 Rice (NY) Sewell (AL)
 Richmond Sherman
 Ros-Lehtinen Sinema
 Roybal-Allard Sires
 Ruiz Slaughter
 Ruppersberger Smith (NJ)
 Rush Smith (WA)
 Ryan (OH) Speier
 Sánchez, Linda Swalwell (CA)
 T. Takano
 Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (CA)
 Sanford Thompson (MS)
 Sarbanes Titus

Garrett
 Gibson
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Grijalva
 Veasey
 Hahn
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jolly
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb
 Lofgren

Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Miller (FL)
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Posey
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Reichert
 Rice (NY)

Richmond
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)

Pompeo
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Salmon
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Upton
 Valadao
 Van Hollen
 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

NOT VOTING—6

Hastings Issa Poe (TX)
 Hurt (VA) Pearce Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1811

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

Stated for:
 Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I was not
 present for rollcall vote No. 450 on the Lam-
 born of Colorado Amendment No. 68 to H.R.
 5538, Department of the Interior, Environment,
 and Related Agencies Act, 2017. Had I been
 present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF
 FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY)
 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 197, noes 231,
 not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]
 AYES—197

Adams Cartwright DeLauro
 Aguilar Castor (FL) DelBene
 Bass Castro (TX) DeSantis
 Beatty Chu, Judy DeSaulnier
 Becerra Cicilline Deutch
 Bera Clark (MA) Dingell
 Beyer Clarke (NY) Doggett
 Bilirakis Clawson (FL) Dold
 Bishop (GA) Clay Donovan
 Blumenaucr Cleaver Doyle, Michael
 Bonamici Clyburn F.
 Boyle, Brendan Coffman Duckworth
 F. Cohen Edwards
 Brady (PA) Connolly Ellison
 Brown (FL) Costa Engel
 Brownley (CA) Courtney Eshoo
 Buchanan Crenshaw Esty
 Bustos Crowley Farr
 Butterfield Cummings Foster
 Capps Curbelo (FL) Frankel (FL)
 Capuano Davis (CA) Fudge
 Cárdenas Davis, Danny Gabbard
 Carney DeGette Gallego
 Carson (IN) Delaney Garamendi

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooper
 Costello (PA)
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 Denham
 Dent
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy

NOES—231

Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Poxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Gene
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 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)
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan

Hastings
 Issa

Pearce
 Poe (TX)

Takai

NOT VOTING—5

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1814

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

Stated for:
 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, this evening I
 inadvertently voted "nay" on rollcall No. 451.
 As an opponent of seismic airgun testing, I
 duly intended to vote "yea."

Stated against:
 Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, earlier today, I inad-
 vertently pressed the wrong button when vot-
 ing on rollcall Vote No. 451. I intended to vote
 "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Washington (Mr.
 NEWHOUSE) on which further pro-
 ceedings were postponed and on which
 the ayes 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 223, noes 201,
 not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]
 AYES—223

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Bost
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Clawson (FL)
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Cuellar
 Culberson

Davidson Kelly (MS)
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (PA)
 Denham King (IA)
 DeSantis King (NY)
 DesJarlais Kinzinger (IL)
 Diaz-Balart Kirkpatrick
 Duffy Kline
 Duncan (SC) Knight
 Duncan (TN) Labrador
 Ellmers (NC) LaHood
 Emmer (MN) LaMalfa
 Farenthold Lamborn
 Fincher Lance
 Fleischmann Latta
 Fleming Long
 Forbes Loudermilk
 Fortenberry Love
 Foxx Lucas
 Franks (AZ) Luetkemeyer
 Frelinghuysen Lummis
 Garrett Marchant
 Gibbs Massie
 Gibson McCarthy
 Gohmert McCaul
 Goodlatte McClintock
 Gosar McHenry
 Gowdy McKinley
 Granger McMorris
 Graves (GA) Rodgers
 Graves (LA) McSally
 Graves (MO) Meadows
 Griffith Mica
 Grothman Miller (FL)
 Guinta Miller (MI)
 Guthrie Moolenaar
 Hardy Mooney (WV)
 Harper Mullin
 Harris Mulvaney
 Hartzler Murphy (PA)
 Heck (NV) Neugebauer
 Hensarling Newhouse
 Herrera Beutler Noem
 Hice, Jody B. Nugent
 Hill Nunes
 Holding Olson
 Hudson Palazzo
 Huelskamp Palmer
 Huizenga (MI) Perry
 Hultgren Peterson
 Hunter Pittenger
 Hurd (TX) Pitts
 Hurt (VA) Poliquin
 Jenkins (KS) Pompeo
 Jenkins (WV) Posey
 Johnson (OH) Price, Tom
 Johnson, Sam Ratchiffe
 Jolly Reed
 Jones Reichert
 Jordan Renacci
 Joyce Rice (SC)

NOES—201

Adams Cooper
 Aguilar Costa
 Bass Costello (PA)
 Beatty Courtney
 Becerra Crowley
 Bera Cummings
 Beyer Curbelo (FL)
 Bishop (GA) Davis (GA)
 Bishop (MI) Davis, Danny
 Blumenauer DeFazio
 Bonamici DeGette
 Boyle, Brendan F. Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Dent
 DeSaulnier
 Buchanan Deutch
 Bustos Dingell
 Butterfield Doggett
 Capps Dold
 Capuano Donovan
 Cárdenas Doyle, Michael
 Carney F.
 Carson (IN) Duckworth
 Cartwright Edwards
 Castor (FL) Ellison
 Castro (TX) Engel
 Chu, Judy Eshoo
 Cicilline Esty
 Clark (MA) Farr
 Clarke (NY) Fitzpatrick
 Clay Foster
 Cleaver Frankel (FL)
 Clyburn Fudge
 Cohen Gabbard
 Connolly Gallego
 Conyers Garamendi

Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Stefanik
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Stewart
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Upton
 Valadao
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marino
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meehan
 Meeks
 Meng
 Messer
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross

Flores
 Hastings
 Issa

O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sewall (AL)
 Sherman
 Sinema

NOT VOTING—9

Paulsen
 Pearce
 Poe (TX)

Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Trott
 Tsongas
 Turner
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Whitfield
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

There was no objection.
 The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 823

Whereas, on June 28, 2016, suicide bombers attacked the Ataturk International Airport in Istanbul Turkey, opened fire and detonated explosives, resulting in the loss of at least 44 innocent lives and severely wounding over 200, including an American citizen;

Whereas Turkish first responders and law enforcement reacted swiftly and heroically, caring for the wounded and taking immediate actions to prevent subsequent attacks and further loss of innocent life;

Whereas the White House issued a statement condemning the attack “in the strongest possible terms” and states that “We remain steadfast in our support for Turkey, our NATO Ally and partner, along with all of our friends and allies around the world, as we continue to confront the threat of terrorism”;

Whereas the Government of Turkey has stated militants from the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) are responsible for the attack, and this attack resembles those carried out by ISIS in other parts of the world;

Whereas the loss of innocent lives in Istanbul strengthens our shared resolve to defeat ISIS and its terrorist affiliates, which pose a growing threat to international peace and stability;

Whereas Turkey is a longstanding member of NATO and has played a crucial role in transatlantic security since joining the alliance more than half a century ago; and

Whereas we stand in solidarity with the people of Turkey in their time of national mourning, ready to provide assistance in bringing to justice all those involved with the planning and execution of these attacks, as well as identifying and disrupting any plans to undertake similar assaults in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Istanbul, Turkey, on June 28, 2016, that resulted in the loss of at least 44 lives;

(2) expresses its condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed in the attacks and expresses its sympathies to those individuals who have been injured;

(3) supports efforts to bring to justice those involved with the planning and execution of these terrorist attacks; and

(4) declares that the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) poses a fundamental security threat to the United States and our allies.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1817

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 451, I inadvertently voted “aye”, when I intended to vote “no.” On rollcall 452, I inadvertently voted “no”, and I intended to vote “aye.”

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) 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. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONDEMNING IN THE STRONGEST TERMS THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN ISTANBUL, TURKEY, ON JUNE 28, 2016, THAT RESULTED IN THE LOSS OF AT LEAST 44 LIVES

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 823, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ATTACK ON THE PULSE ORLANDO NIGHTCLUB, HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE ATTACK, OFFERING CONDOLENCES TO AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THEIR FAMILIES AND FRIENDS AND ALL THOSE AFFECTED, AND APPLAUDING THE DEDICATION AND BRAVERY OF LAW ENFORCEMENT, EMERGENCY RESPONSE, AND COUNTERTERRORISM OFFICIALS IN RESPONDING TO THE ATTACK

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government

Reform, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Homeland Security be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 827, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 827

Whereas, in the early hours of Sunday, June 12, 2016, a 29-year-old man from Ft. Pierce, Florida, killed 49 and wounded 53 innocent people in a horrific terrorist attack on Pulse Orlando, a lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender nightclub, during Latin night;

Whereas the gunman, who was investigated in 2013–2014 by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (in this preamble referred to as the “FBI”) for possible connections to terrorism, pledged his allegiance to the leader of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (in this preamble referred to as “ISIL”);

Whereas President Barack Obama called the attack an act of both terror and hate as well as an attack on all of the people of the United States and the fundamental values of equality and dignity;

Whereas the attack is the deadliest mass shooting in the modern history of the United States and the worst terrorist attack on United States soil since September 11, 2001;

Whereas the law enforcement professionals of the city of Orlando and Orange County, Florida, the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, the FBI, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, and other emergency and health care professionals responded to the attack bravely and admirably and in a coordinated manner, saving many lives;

Whereas following the attack hundreds of people stood in long lines to donate blood for those injured in the attack, and the people of Orlando, the State of Florida, and the United States expressed overwhelming support for the victims and their families regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, or sexual orientation; and

Whereas the threat of terrorist attacks against the United States and the people of the United States persists, including the threat posed by homegrown terrorists inspired by foreign terrorist organizations like ISIL: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the horrific terrorist attack on the Pulse Orlando nightclub on June 12, 2016, in which 49 innocent people were killed and 53 injured;

(2) honors the memory of the victims killed in the attack and offers heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies for their families, loved ones, and friends;

(3) expresses hope for a full and speedy recovery by and pledges continued support for those injured in the attack;

(4) applauds the dedication and bravery of local, State, and Federal law enforcement and counterterrorism officials for their efforts to respond to the attack and secure communities;

(5) stands together with all people of the United States, regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, or sexual orientation, in the face of terror and hate; and

(6) reaffirms the commitment of the United States and its allies to defeat the Is-

lamic State of Iraq and the Levant and other terrorist groups at home and abroad and to address the threat posed by homegrown terrorism.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTENNIAL COMMISSION ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5722) to establish the John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, of course, I will not object, but I do want to thank the majority leader and I want to thank the Speaker. We have all joined in this resolution. It is almost exactly like that which we passed for Ronald Reagan—two Presidents who contributed greatly, not only to the wellness of this country and the greatness of this country, but also two Presidents who inspired so many Americans about their country, about their government, and about participation by average citizens in their government.

I thank Mr. CHAFFETZ for bringing this to the floor, and I urge strong support of the resolution.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah.

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5722

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 “John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission Act”.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established a commission to be known as the “John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission” (in this Act referred to as the “Commission”).

SEC. 3. DUTIES OF COMMISSION.

The Commission shall—

(1) plan, develop, and carry out such activities as the Commission considers fitting and proper to honor John F. Kennedy on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth;

(2) provide advice and assistance to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, as well as civic groups to carry out activities to honor John F. Kennedy on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth;

(3) develop activities that may be carried out by the Federal Government that are fitting and proper to honor John F. Kennedy on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth; and

(4) submit to the President and Congress reports pursuant to section 7.

SEC. 4. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 11 members as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Interior.

(2) Four members appointed by the President after considering the recommendations of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation.

(3) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(4) One Member of the House of Representatives appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(5) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the majority leader of the Senate.

(6) One Member of the Senate appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

(b) EX OFFICIO MEMBER.—The Archivist of the United States shall serve in an ex officio capacity on the Commission to provide advice and information to the Commission.

(c) TERMS.—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(d) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—All members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Commission shall—

(1) not affect the powers of the Commission; and

(2) be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(f) RATES OF PAY.—Members shall not receive compensation for the performance of their duties on behalf of the Commission.

(g) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses during the performance of duties of the Commission while away from home or his or her regular place of business, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum to conduct business, but two or more members may hold hearings.

(i) CHAIRPERSON.—The chairperson of the Commission shall be elected by a majority vote of the members of the Commission.

SEC. 5. DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF COMMISSION.

(a) DIRECTOR AND STAFF.—The Commission shall appoint an executive director and such other additional employees as are necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The executive director and employees of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other employees may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(c) DETAIL OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Upon request of the Commission, the Secretary of the Interior or the Archivist of the United States may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the employees of that department or agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties under this Act.

(d) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure such temporary and intermittent services as are necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties.

(e) VOLUNTEER AND UNCOMPENSATED SERVICES.—Notwithstanding section 1342 of title 31, United States Code, the Commission may accept and use voluntary and uncompensated services as the Commission determines necessary.

SEC. 6. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) **HEARINGS.**—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence as the Commission considers appropriate.

(b) **MAILS.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(c) **OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.**—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out its duties under this Act. Upon request of the chairperson of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish that information to the Commission.

(d) **GIFTS, BEQUESTS, DEVISES.**—The Commission may solicit, accept, use, and dispose of gifts, bequests, or devises of money, services, or property, both real and personal, for the purpose of aiding or facilitating its work.

(e) **AVAILABLE SPACE.**—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall make available nationwide to the Commission, at a normal rental rate for Federal agencies, such assistance and facilities as may be necessary for the Commission to carry out its duties under this Act.

(f) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—The Commission may enter into contracts with and compensate government and private agencies or persons to enable the Commission to discharge its duties under this Act.

SEC. 7. REPORTS.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress annual reports on the revenue and expenditures of the Commission, including a list of each gift, bequest, or devise to the Commission with a value of more than \$250, together with the identity of the donor of each gift, bequest, or devise.

(b) **INTERIM REPORTS.**—The Commission may submit to the President and Congress interim reports as the Commission considers appropriate.

(c) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than August 31, 2017, the Commission shall submit a final report to the President and the Congress containing—

(1) a summary of the activities of the Commission;

(2) a final accounting of funds received and expended by the Commission; and

(3) the findings, conclusions, and final recommendations of the Commission.

SEC. 8. TERMINATION.

The Commission may terminate on such date as the Commission may determine after it submits its final report pursuant to section 7(c), but not later than September 30, 2017.

SEC. 9. ANNUAL AUDIT.

The Inspector General of the Department of the Interior may perform an audit of the Commission, shall make the results of any audit performed available to the public, and shall transmit such results to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 10. PROHIBITION ON OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

No Federal funds may be obligated to carry out this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 4 of rule XVI, I move that

when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The motion was agreed to.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2017**

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material for the further consideration of H.R. 5538, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 820 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. 5538.

Will the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) kindly take the chair.

□ 1824

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. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (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, amendment No. 73 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 76 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out the powers granted under section 3063 of title 18, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), for his and his colleagues on Appropriations' work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Environmental Protection Agency spends as much as \$50 million per year to employ nearly 200 armed agents at an average cost of \$216,000 per year per agent. In total, over the period from fiscal year 2006 to fiscal year 2015, the EPA spent an estimated \$715 million for its criminal enforcement program.

These 200 agents are equipped with guns and ammunition up to 30 millimeter in caliber, camouflage and other deceptive equipment, night vision, unmanned aircraft, and other military-style equipment.

A 2015 report noted that the EPA spent \$24,700 on ammunition between 75 millimeter and 125 millimeter and \$23,000 on ammunition over 125 millimeter. If this is true, what possible use could the EPA have for purchasing rounds of that size?

The EPA is just one of more than 67 Federal agencies that employ armed personnel, many of whom most Americans would never associate with law enforcement. These include the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Federal Reserve Board, and the National Institutes of Health, among others.

Federal agencies should be able to clearly demonstrate their need for armed personnel and, absent such a demonstration, should rely on local law enforcement when there is a need for armed protection.

My amendment would prohibit funding for EPA's armed agents and begin to address the troubling trend of the militarization in our Federal agencies. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's concerns about sometimes the perception of overreach, and sometimes the real perception of overreach, by agencies of the United States Government.

I have taken a lot of shots at the Environmental Protection Agency, and probably will continue to do so. However, this amendment reaches too far.

We may not always agree on where it is appropriate to draw the line on environmental laws and regulations. Some think some standards are too stringent, and others will say they are not tough enough. That is a fair policy debate to have, and that is what we are doing tonight. However, we know, no matter where the line is ultimately drawn, there are individuals out there who are willingly and knowingly trying to find ways around those laws.

As such, EPA needs the ability to look into criminal activity, whether it is illegal dumping of waste, negligent

dumping of toxics or oil, and the illegal importation of products from other countries by those who would choose to ignore U.S. law. We can debate the laws and what is appropriate, but we can't give criminals a free pass to ignore the laws that are on the books.

Saying that, I would like to continue to work with the gentleman, recognizing that whether or not these agencies are properly using the police powers that they have and the type of organizations that they have to enforce the law, they must enforce the law and they must be able to protect themselves in sometimes very difficult situations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1830

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would not hinder the EPA's ability to enforce the laws on the books. This amendment only limits their ability to employ armed personnel. The EPA will still be able to investigate and prosecute environmental crimes. They will simply have to rely on local law enforcement—or on Federal law enforcement when Federal law enforcement would be appropriate—and when there is a need for armed protection. They could, again, rely on local law enforcement or on Federal law enforcement when the need applies.

If the EPA believes that it needs armed protection, we should have a full disclosure of all of the EPA's criminal enforcement assets and a public debate about the need for the arms and equipment being used by the EPA. When we are talking about 75-millimeter ammunition, we are basically talking about an anti-tank round. When we are talking about 125-millimeter, we are talking about a tank round. They have amphibious assault vehicles, and they have other equipment that really makes them look like a military operation. It is also an enormous amount of money that has been invested here.

I would be happy—and I really appreciate the gentleman's desire—to have a discussion about this, and I look forward to having that discussion. I agree that we want to make sure that the people who work for our Federal agencies are protected, especially when they are involved in investigations in an enforcement capacity. We don't want any one of them to leave his home in the morning to go to work and be injured or worse and not be able to return home that evening. But we do need to have a serious discussion about how much we are spending, and the militarization of the Federal agencies should be of concern to all of us.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I would share my concern about the growth of the utilization of these types of weapons within various agencies, not just within the EPA, and whether or not the U.S. Marshals office, which was used in the past, shouldn't be brought back to some degree, espe-

cially the SWAT teams and so forth, which are highly trained in sometimes very delicate situations.

Training, of course, as we know, is extremely important, and the folks who work in various agencies may not get the type of training they need in sometimes very difficult situations. I think we need to look at it, but these agents who are working for the Environmental Protection Agency sometimes need to protect themselves. We can debate whether or not they need the type of ammunition and the types of guns that the gentleman is talking about.

I think that, right now, this amendment goes too far. Again, I will work with the gentleman down the road because I do have some concerns about that. It is not just the EPA. We have got a number of agencies that seem to be arming themselves, which I have some concerns about.

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

Mr. PALMER. I thank the gentleman for expressing his concerns and for his willingness to work with us on this.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that weapons have proliferated among the Federal agencies. As I said, there are 67 agencies. We are spending an enormous amount of money on this, and we are not doing a particularly good job of keeping up with the weapons' inventory. We have had situations in which weapons have been lost or stolen—in one case, with the tragic result of the murder of Kate Steinle, in which the weapon had been stolen from the automobile of a ranger from the Bureau of Land Management.

I just think we have to take a long, hard look at the real need for arming Federal agencies. Some of them make absolutely no sense, like with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and particularly with the EPA. The EPA is one of the most feared agencies in the Federal Government. I put them right up there next to the IRS. To think that you have got armed agents with the kind of equipment and weapons that they have is a serious, serious issue that my amendment addresses. It has already, I think, initiated a much-needed debate on this issue.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, I oppose this amendment. I would be happy to work with the gentleman in the future to come to some resolution of this problem. I do agree that it is a concern that we should all work together on, on both sides, because the so-called militarization of some of these agencies is concerning, but individuals within these agencies should be able to protect themselves in situations that may arise from time to time. I would urge opposition of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 77 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chair, on behalf of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to treat the New Mexico Meadow Jumping Mouse as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) was called away. I am standing in for him and want to join the previous amendment offerer in thanking the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, as well as the staff of that committee, for their hard work on this piece of legislation.

This amendment would affect the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse. As a result of the habitat designations, the U.S. Forest Service has begun to construct electric fences around the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse's habitat, which is located around floodplains and streambeds in New Mexico.

The problem is a number of these critical habitat designations coincide with ranching allotments in New Mexico where ranchers hold what we call territorial water rights. Those are water rights that existed and belonged to these ranchers before New Mexico was even a State. These longstanding water rights provide access that is essential to these ranches. This amendment is needed because the Fish and Wildlife Service and Forest Service are not effectively working with ranchers to maintain their operations.

There is also an issue about the science surrounding this mouse. The mouse has never been seen in a number of the critical habitat areas, and the few mouse sightings on record were made nearly a decade ago. The agencies themselves have admitted that the science used to list the species and designate the critical habitat is seriously

limited. Despite that science gap, farmers and ranchers are being denied their private property rights—their territorial water rights—and are being driven from their allotments all for a mouse that may not even exist in these areas.

Voting for this amendment will send a clear message to the Fish and Wildlife Service that species listings that are not backed by sound science will not stand. We cannot allow unsubstantiated science to destroy the lives of American citizens and the history and heritage of the ranching community and the culture of the ranching community that even predates New Mexico's admission into the Union.

For this reason, I ask that my colleagues support the Pearce amendment to delist this species until legitimate and up-to-date science is available.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PALMER). The gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this would prohibit the Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing or enforcing the Endangered Species listing of the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act, and it would restrict the Service from offering any critical protections to preserve the species.

I heard clearly what my good friend said, and having a grandfather who is a rancher in Montana, I hear what she is saying. However, once a species is listed under the Endangered Species Act, the role of Fish and Wildlife Service is primarily permissive—it is permissive—in helping parties to comply with the act as they carry out their activities.

The majority of the habitat for the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse is on Federal land, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is working with the Forest Service to develop a conservation measure that will protect the mouse while, clearly, allowing livestock raising on Forest Service lands and ensuring adequate water for the cattle, which they should do.

Since the Endangered Species listing, members of the livestock community have voiced concerns about the impacts to people who recreate and make their livelihoods on Forest Service lands which result from addressing the needs of the meadow jumping mouse. The Fish and Wildlife Service listened clearly to these concerns, and they have established three working groups to address these concerns. They have come up with creative solutions, like establishing the cattle lanes, which I am sure the gentlewoman was referring to, to make sure the cattle can maintain access to the water while protecting the vegetation that is necessary for the survival of the meadow jumping mouse.

Under this amendment, the Service would not be able to continue to recover the species, though all of the Endangered Species Act prohibitions would still apply. The Service would not be able to work collaboratively with these stakeholders to provide ESA compliance. The Service has a statutory requirement to implement the Endangered Species Act. Defunding the agency's ability to fulfill this legal requirement makes everyone more vulnerable to losses, which is an unnecessary cause for the American taxpayer. Additionally, this amendment limits the Service from undertaking required status reviews of the subspecies or from initiating any rulemaking to down list or to delist a species as is appropriate.

I believe that the Fish and Wildlife Service, with the working groups, can come up with a creative solution. We should also allow Fish and Wildlife to be able to down list or to delist the species. If what the gentlewoman is reporting is true, her amendment would not give them the ability to do that. I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a water rights issue in addition to an Endangered Species Act issue. This is an instance in which private water rights are being abrogated for the sake of a mouse that we don't even know exists in this area and the science about which makes it so you can't tell one subspecies from the other of this meadow jumping mouse unless you actually kill the mouse and look at its skull. Now, when it is that extreme in figuring out whether a mouse is endangered or not—whether it is a Preble's meadow jumping mouse or a New Mexico meadow jumping mouse or some other subspecies—we have got a problem with the science.

To block people from territorial water rights—using electric fences in a way that is based on science that is this obscure—doesn't sound, to me, like an effective means by which to work with the ranchers, the culture, and the livelihoods of the people involved. Therefore, once again, I urge support of the Pearce amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. Lummis).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1845

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 78 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), I offer amendment No. 78.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to treat the Mexican wolf (*Canis lupus baileyi*) as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or to implement a recovery plan for such species that applies in any area outside the historic range of such species.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of Mr. PEARCE to offer amendment No. 78 to H.R. 5538. The Pearce-Gosar amendment allows for the responsible State management of the Mexican wolf in Arizona and New Mexico. It will also prevent the United States Fish and Wildlife Service from expanding the population for this species outside of its historic range.

One of the main issues for the wolf recovery is an extremely outdated recovery plan being utilized by the Service. The Mexican wolf was first listed as an endangered species in 1976. In 1982, Mexico and the United States signed the Mexican Wolf Recovery Plan, which the Service is still currently utilizing today. As a result, this plan is significantly outdated and is not based on the best available science.

Without an updated plan that includes recovery criteria, the Mexican wolf will remain on the endangered species list in perpetuity. The Service has recently expressed interest in re-drafting its recovery plan. However, the agency has done this in the past but has failed to make any updates and has instead caved to radical environmental groups.

Another major issue arose early last year when the Service expanded the recovery zone for the wolf by four times its previous size without first securing the funding to manage the new acreage. The results have been disastrous for private citizens who face longer wait times for wolf disturbances, as well as the species, whose numbers have also declined under the failed management plan of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

In December 2015, the Service confirmed that the agency was again considering introducing the species into areas outside its historic range. This expansion effort is extremely misguided, as 90 percent of the Mexican wolf's historic range is in Mexico.

The four Governors from the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah sent a bipartisan letter to Department of the Interior Secretary Sally Jewell expressing serious concern in opposition to this approach.

On July 8, 2015, the Arizona attorney general and the Arizona Game and Fish

Department filed a lawsuit against the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service “for failing their statutory duty to develop an updated recovery plan to guide the Mexican wolf recovery.”

In April of 2016, the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish also filed a lawsuit against the Service, claiming that the agency was ignoring the “laws and regulations of New Mexico” by releasing wolves without State permits.

Last month, a Federal judge sided with the New Mexico State government and granted the State a temporary injunction preventing the Service from releasing any more Mexican wolves into the wild.

Adding to this debacle, this week the Department of the Interior’s Office of Inspector General released a scathing report of the Mexican Gray Wolf Recovery Program, which revealed some serious structural issues with the program, including subversive actions taken by the Fish and Wildlife Service staff overseeing the program.

In lieu of the current circumstances, I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to allow the respective States to protect and manage the species, not the Washington bureaucrats with a track record of failure.

The amendment is supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation; Americans for Limited Government; the Public Lands Council; the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association; Arizona Cattle Feeders Association; Arizona Farm Bureau Federation; Arizona Liberty; Dona Ana Soil and Water Conservation District; Gila County Cattle Growers Association; Idaho Recreation Council; New Mexico Cattle Growers’ Association; New Mexico Wool Growers, Incorporated; New Mexico Federal Lands Council Wildlife biologist Mary Darling; taxpayers John Fowler, James Goughnour, Gary Kiehne, Therese Griffin Hicks, Becky Nutt, Jim and Sue Chilton; and countless other individuals and organizations.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for their time and for their good work on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I understand and I hear clearly what the gentleman was saying that the plan needs to be updated, refreshed, and people need to be involved in it. I would be happy to work with the gentleman to make sure that the Fish and Wildlife Service lives up to its responsibilities in doing that, but I strongly oppose this amendment.

The Mexican wolf is the most endangered subspecies of wolf in the world. The population is now estimated at approximately 97 wolves in the wild. Biologists believe that, when the Mexican

wolf population returns to a healthy number, that it will restore balance to the Southwest ecosystem by keeping deer, elk, and other prey populations strong by preventing overpopulation and overgrazing of habitat.

The reintroduction of wolves into Yellowstone, for example, demonstrates how top predators like wolves maintain the balance of nature. Elk in Yellowstone are now more wary and avoid standing in the open near streams. Willows and aspens have come back and, with them, birds and beavers. With the beavers came the ponds and more fish. The presence of wolves has also led to fewer coyotes, which boosted the population of pronghorn, antelope, and fox.

I have been in Yellowstone, and I have been out there and have seen the stream recovery and all of these things that I just spoken of. I have actually seen this recovery happen. In the Southwest, scientists expect similar benefits to wildlife, sportsmen, and to everyone who enjoys the outdoors.

This amendment would prohibit the Service from managing wolves in the wild, including the capture and removal of problem wolves and assisting livestock producers to manage wolf-livestock conflicts, such as using radio collars and hazardous techniques.

So I oppose the gentleman’s amendment because it would undermine the Service’s ability to work collaboratively with local communities and ranchers. And I hear you clearly say that they need to do a better job with that, and I agree that we need to do the best job we can.

We need to be able to make sure that the ESA compliance to protect private citizens from taking violations under section 9 of the ESA, a third party could sue them. So, by your amendment, you expose citizens from take violations under section 9 of the ESA, and the third party then, in fact, could be sued.

It would prohibit any efforts to prevent conflicts with wolves or update the recovery plan, as I agree, probably needs to be updated.

So it is clear, as you can see, I think we should be supporting the Fish and Wildlife Service in its efforts to manage this imperiled species and not block the agency from doing its job.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the gentlewoman that I am from Wyoming. I actually had to endure and watch what the Fish and Wildlife Service actually erroneously did with introducing the nonnative wolves into the Yellowstone Park area. They made superpacks of wolves and actually ended up costing 60 percent of the Shiras moose herd. So I am very, very aware of this.

This amendment will not force the wolf into extinction. They are going extinct because of the Fish and Wildlife Service. States have proven better at species conservation and management than the bloated bureaucracy, and the only way they respond is through frivolous lawsuits.

Again, 90 percent of the Mexican wolf’s historic range is in Mexico. Arizona and New Mexico both want the ability to manage this species in the United States. The Mexican wolf has lingered on the Endangered Species Act for nearly 40 years, and it will go extinct at the rate that the Fish and Wildlife Service is doing. It is time to do something right and return it back to the States.

Again, I urge support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, I would just like to point out that the Mexican wolf is the most endangered subspecies of all wolves in the world. The population is now estimated at approximately 97 wolves in the wild. So I believe we should be supporting the Fish and Wildlife Service in its efforts to manage this imperiled species, not blocking the agency from doing its job.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 79 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, administer, purchase, acquire, or operate an unmanned aircraft system owned by the Department of Interior or the Environmental Protection Agency to perform surveying, mapping, or collecting remote sensing data.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prevents the Department of the Interior and the EPA from using

in-house agency assets and, specifically, their agency owned and operated UAS for land surveying, mapping, imaging, and other such remote sensing activities.

Mr. Chairman, you may have heard that last month the Federal Aviation Administration, the FAA, announced that the new small UAS unmanned aerial system—UAS rule, part 107, including all pilot and operating rules—will be effective on August 29 of this year. That is important because that will allow commercial activity in the UAS arena, not just government activity.

Now, perhaps no new technology in history will revolutionize the aerial surveying and mapping community like unmanned aerial systems. The benefits of commercial and private UAS are incalculable. Technology has moved forward rapidly, and what used to be considered toys are quickly becoming powerful commercial tools that provide enormous benefits in terms of safety and efficiency.

When UAS are performing missions connected to surveying and mapping areas for stewardship decisions and public policy, society is only just beginning to realize the full potential of the unmanned aerial system. Indeed, the demand for UAS for business purposes has been far reaching and continues to grow. UAS technology is already bringing substantial benefits to people's daily lives.

The timely acquisition of geospatial data is critical to assessment, realtime decisionmaking, and mitigation during and immediately following both natural and manmade disasters, including earthquakes, tornadoes, blizzards, floods, volcanic eruptions, wildfires, hurricanes, infrastructure disasters, including collapsed buildings, bridges, and dams, ruptured pipelines, various types of terrorists incidents, and in emergency blue tarp surveys to support postdisaster response.

There is a concern that agencies like the USGS and the Bureau of Land Management are acquiring unmanned aerial systems and regularly utilizing them on projects that can be accomplished by the private sector, directly competing with the private sector. The result is a loss of business for the private sector under contract to other Federal mapping agencies.

The government is getting a leg up on the private sector by obtaining certificates of authorization, or COAs, which are required to fly the UAS and performing services with UAS that are otherwise commercial in nature. Currently, there is no effective enforcement and oversight to prevent government abuse of such authority for commercial purposes.

The fact that government agencies can operate a UAS while the private sector cannot as freely or timely gain airspace access has created an uneven playing field. Allowing the Department of the Interior to use UAS in direct competition with the private sector is not only poor stewardship of taxpayer

money, but it is also an inefficient use of resources. It also results in the government duplicating and directly competing with private enterprise, which is something that we don't seek to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, while I agree there are many other implications in this amendment, I am going to speak about how this would affect the ability to fight wildland fires.

So far this year, wildland fires have burned more than 2.3 million acres. Certainly, in my State, in California, we unfortunately have some significant fires going on right now. Right now, throughout the United States, we have 16 active large fires.

Now, we can get in a policy discussion of whether or not we should be contracting out utilization of this new technology to the private sector. I tend to agree with you. I think it is a better use of taxpayer's money overall to contract this out. This is more of an authorizing decision than it is an appropriating decision. I would hope that the authorizers would meet and make the policy on how we should do this.

Right now, as we sit here today, unmanned aircraft systems are being used by fire managers and fire crews, and we need to make sure that we ensure the safety of these fire crews and protect the communities to the best of their ability.

You are right that this technology has moved very rapidly. This is a way that they use to find the hotspots to be able to use communications with aerial vehicles to drop the water or chemical on the fire more effectively and more efficiently. We may be able to do this with private contractors, but right now we don't know who is the best trained and so forth.

Again, we are the appropriating committee. We pay the bills; and I think because of this technology, the authorizing committees need to set policy on this and start working on doing this and start doing that through their regular order.

So right now, I would oppose this amendment. Our fire crews right now need this equipment, and I wouldn't take that away from them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, last year I rose in opposition to this amendment because it failed to account for the Department's need to utilize unmanned systems in times of emergency. Let me give you a couple of examples. We had a conversation. I was hoping that when I saw the amendment

this year, you might have made some accommodations for this.

Use of remote sensing via unmanned aircraft makes sense. It allows for rapid collection of data and allows for the Department to get a closer look at natural disasters. The Department and the USGS are using unmanned aircraft to monitor the spread of wildfires, as the chairman pointed out, monitor river bank erosion, detect and locate coal seam fires, conduct waterfowl surveys, and inspect abandoned mines.

I think the chairman said it best, we need to have the authorizing committee look at this because, I think the gentleman would agree, there are times when good things can be done; but this amendment, unfortunately, doesn't allow that to happen.

I thank Chairman CALVERT for yielding me the time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I find a lot in common with the chairman and the gentlewoman from Minnesota. Certainly in times of emergency we would want to use the assets that are available to us immediately. The amendment says it prohibits the Agency to perform surveying, mapping, or collecting remote sensing data. None of those are, generally speaking, an emergency situation; so I find some agreement, but this is what the amendment says.

I just want to let everybody know that this is a \$73 billion market, and while we wait around in the United States and wait on the FAA to promulgate rules beyond the line of sight, et cetera, the market moves further and further away from the United States. It drives more than \$1 trillion in economic activity. More than 500,000 American jobs are related to the collection, storage, and dissemination of imagery and geospatial data. Another 5.3 million workers utilize such data. As much as 90 percent of the government information has a geospatial information component. Up to 80 percent of the information managed by business is connected to a specific location, and it is identified by the Department of Labor as one of just 14 high-gross sectors of the United States workforce.

I find it problematic that we are giving our government a leg up when the private sector is the one that pays for the government, and they are on the cutting edge of this. This amendment is supported by the American Farm Bureau; the Business Coalition for Fair Competition; and MAPPS, the association of mapping and geospatial firms.

I understand the arguments on the other side, but I think it is important that we stay on the cutting edge and we move forward in the private sector and not empower and enrich the government sector in this regard. So with

all due respect, I hope that my colleagues will vote in favor of the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, in closing, based upon the way we read this amendment, it would shut down the Department of the Interior's current operations and eliminate its ability to use unmanned aircraft systems. While that may not be the intent of the amendment, that is what it says and does, according to our folks who have read through it.

Now, hopefully next year, as we go through the authorization process, we can come back here and have a policy because I believe in private contracting for these type of services, but right now I don't want to have the unintended consequence of taking away vital equipment that is being utilized at this time. So I would reluctantly oppose the gentleman's amendment and hope that we could come to a resolution within the next year and not just within the Department of the Interior. There are other departments who use this.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 80 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ Appropriations made in this Act for the Environmental Protection Agency are hereby reduced by 17 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will reduce the funding to the Environmental Protection Agency by 17 percent to ensure the EPA bureaucrats are not immune to the negative impacts of their actions in the form of regulation. You wonder why 17 percent. I am going to get to that.

EPA regulations generally jeopardize our Nation's access to affordable, reliable power and will lead to skyrocketing electricity costs. By their own admission, and by design, unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in the EPA are pursuing an ideological agenda while imposing real costs in the real world on the economy and on everyday Americans.

An analysis conducted by the National Economic Research Associates, or NERA, in November of 2015 found compliance with the Clean Power Plan would cost consumers and businesses nearly \$300 billion from 2022 to 2033. Now, despite these staggering costs, the Clean Power Plan will have virtually no effect on climate change as it reduces atmospheric CO₂ concentrations by less than one-half of 1 percent. One-half of 1 percent, and that cost \$300 billion in that period of time.

NERA estimates the Clean Power Plan will burden Pennsylvania—the State where I am privileged to represent a district—with an average annual electricity price of 17 percent. That is where I came up with the 17 percent. They are saying that my constituents are going to pay 17 percent more for their power. So it seems to me that the EPA should feel the pain as well. You can see what the estimated burden imposed on each State is by the Clean Power Plan at the Web site www.americaspower.org/nera. You can check it out for yourself. Because you don't live in Pennsylvania, it might be a little more, it might be a lot more.

This amendment will ensure that bureaucrats in the EPA will feel the impact that their ideological agenda has imposed on the American citizen by reducing the appropriations for the EPA by 17 percent. My consumers, my citizens, my voters didn't have any choice in this. They are just going to have to pay 17 percent more for their electricity. This amounts to a funding reduction of about \$1.4 billion. That is what it costs the EPA. It costs every one of my consumers 17 percent every time they pay their electricity bill. It is only fair that the EPA is forced to make hard decisions as to how to divide up its smaller budgets as it has forced to do what the families that I am privileged to represent have to do if this rule is enacted.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I don't want the gentleman from Pennsylvania to think I am picking on him because I certainly understand and share the gentleman's frustration with EPA and with this administration's overzealous regulatory agenda. In fact, in this bill, as the gentleman well knows, we tried to reverse all of the overreaching agenda that this administration has placed on the American people.

We have gone through this bill line by line for the Agency's budget to identify areas for targeted and strategic cuts. In total, fiscal year 2017 bill cuts EPA by \$164 million, and \$291 million below Obama's budget request. The bill cuts EPA's air regulatory program \$25 million below the enacted level and \$93 million below President Obama's budget request. The bill denies the Obama administration's request for additional staff at EPA and keeps the number of EPA personnel at the lowest level since 1989. That is when George Herbert Walker Bush was President. I am sure you would like to go back to 1976, but I think we have done a pretty good job of cutting it back to 1989.

Unfortunately, the gentleman's amendment would penalize States by cutting the grants they need. It would reduce the funding for the clean water and drinking water grants, which support construction jobs in every district. It would impact the geographic program, such as the Great Lakes, that are important to many Members. It would reduce funding for the clean-up of toxic Superfund sites, and, unfortunately, the gentleman's proposal for a general cut would impact all those important programs.

I would like to remind the gentleman that with the cuts included in this bill, we have already cut EPA funding by \$2.3 billion or 23 percent in this bill since 2011. So we have continuously done this every year. I looked at this bill very carefully and have tried to do everything we could to make sure that we do responsible cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency without damaging the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose this amendment. I think I have said everything I need to say about this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the chairman's efforts over these many years, and I support everything he has done. What vexes me is with everything that we have done and he has done, the EPA still has found a way to reach into the pockets of my consumers, the people that I represent and take 17 percent of their power bill. They didn't say: Well, you have to take it out of the food budget or, you know, your kids' Boy Scouts dues. They just said: We are taking it right off the top. That is what they said to the consumers I have to represent.

Apparently, no matter how much we take from them or have taken from them so far, they haven't gotten the message yet. I appreciate your position, but in an effort to stand up for the citizens I represent as strongly as I can and to say we don't want a 17 percent hike in our power bills just because the EPA says so, I am going to

ask that my colleagues support the amendment and heap a little more trouble on the EPA, as they are heaping the trouble on the constituents that I am privileged to represent.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RATCLIFFE) assumed the chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the conference report accompanying the bill (S. 524) "An Act to authorize the Attorney General and Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to address the prescription opioid abuse and heroin use crisis, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PALMER). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 81 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to give formal notification under, or prepare, propose, implement, administer, or enforce any rule or recommendation pursuant to, section 115 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7415).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will prevent funds from being used to expand the EPA authority pursuant to section 115 of the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air Act, which has served us well since 1973, hasn't needed to be expanded, it has been used over and over again to make sure that we clean up our act.

Section 115 of the Clean Air Act allows the EPA to mandate State emission levels to whatever amount the Agency deems appropriate if they find two things. Listen to that again. The Clean Air Act, section 115, allows the EPA—the Federal Government—to mandate all 50 of our States' emission levels to whatever amount the Agency deems appropriate—whatever amount—if they find two things. This has been there since 1973. It hasn't been relevant, but it is now. If the EPA finds that U.S. emissions endanger a foreign nation and the endangered nation has a reciprocal agreement to prevent or control emissions in their own nation.

□ 1915

Now, where that comes into play is the Paris climate agreement. It was just signed, and even though it is not a treaty, because we have the Clean Air Act and section 115, it is now operative or potentially operative.

Many believe and have argued that the U.N. Paris climate agreement meets these requirements and, once again, would allow the Federal Government to mandate our State emission levels to whatever amount the agency deems appropriate, period.

The President has proven time and time again that he has no problem circumventing Congress and working unilaterally to achieve his policy priorities. I suspect since he is in favor of the Paris climate agreement, that this is one of his policies.

With the Clean Power Plan caught up in the courts as the President's administration comes to an end, there is a serious concern and a legitimate concern that he will act unilaterally to cement his environmental legacy by enforcing section 114 in this way.

This amendment would block this attempt to delegate nearly unlimited power and authority over the energy sector in each one of our States to unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats at the EPA. Such expansive authority of the EPA would be economically devastating and could threaten the reliability and viability of our Nation's energy sector.

I know the President has got 5, 6 months left to go, and he would like to get as many regulations on the books as possible. We simply cannot let this happen, and we cannot leave it to chance.

I would urge my colleagues to an affirmative vote on this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as has been pointed out, this would block the

EPA from regulating air pollution under section 115 of the Clean Air Act.

Section 115 deals with international pollution and allows the United States to work with other countries in transboundary pollution issues. As we know, pollution doesn't stop at a border. It moves. And it is moving around the planet.

This amendment is a transparent attempt to clearly stop the Paris climate change agreement reached in December 2015. The Paris climate agreement is a milestone in the global effort to combat climate change, something which my constituents feel is very clear, very present, and is a huge problem of which the United States should show leadership in.

More than 190 nations have made commitments to limit their climate-damaging pollution, including all the largest developed and developing countries.

Future U.S. administrations could use section 115 to help ensure that the United States does its part and to provide that other countries do their part too.

The Perry amendment would prohibit the EPA and the White House from even developing a well-considered recommendation or whether or not to use this authority. Congress should not take a tool out of the toolbox for a future administration's climate change mitigation toolbox.

This is a matter of global leadership. The United States needs to meet its Paris climate commitment and, subsequently, any commitment to act in the future.

Congressman PERRY's amendment and similar efforts to thwart the progress on climate change could—I would say "would"—undermine our ability to achieve needed pollution reductions and hit our Paris targets.

This amendment is the latest in a long line of Republican attacks on the Clean Air Act and the EPA's authority to respond to the urgent threat of climate change. A vote for this amendment is another vote, in my opinion, for those who deny climate change is real and to block action to curb the carbon pollution that is driving dangerous climate change.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this is not to deny climate change. This is about authority. Whose authority? The United States and the individual States don't need foreign governments through the Federal administration telling us, telling them how to run their railroads and their businesses and how much they regulate their own clean air pursuant to the 1973 Clean Air Act. That is why we have the Federal Government, and that is why it collaborates with the State.

This agreement is not a treaty ratified by the United States Senate. This is an agreement between individuals that potentially gives the power to the Federal Government to regulate in an unlimited fashion every one of our States.

No one in the States signed up for this. No one in the United States Senate voted on this. This is an agreement between individuals, and it should not be left to stand in this fashion.

This amendment just says that we are going to follow the Clean Air Act, passed in 1973, just like we have been. Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed for the States. It has changed between individuals in this administration and people all around the globe that wish to limit the United States' productivity through regulation.

That is why this amendment is important, and that is why I hope Members will support it.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I had the opportunity recently to be in China, and because of our administration and as the Chinese people and government saw, our bold leadership in standing up and saying that the United States was going to play its role in reducing the harmful effects of climate change, China came to the table for the first time ever and said: You know, we are going to do something about it too.

Now, the gentleman keeps saying that the Senate never voted on it. This has never happened. Well, the Clean Air Act is a law and climate change is real.

This is not 1972, 1973, when I graduated from high school back many years ago. The planet, the climate, the oceans, the ice shelves are all changing. The legacy that we leave for our children and for future generations will be: What does the United States, what does our country do? How do we stand up and show leadership?

So this amendment clearly is an attempt to stop the Paris climate change agreement reached in 2015, something that I say with great pride my constituents in the State of Minnesota think is a good idea and something that we need to move forward on.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, no one denies that the 1973 Clean Air Act isn't law. No one denies that. But what we are pointing out is that, with the Paris accord, it activates section 115 in a way never perceived that to happen in 1973 when the law was passed. They didn't think that other governments were going to control the United States State by State by State. But that is indeed what can happen here—and probably what will happen here.

Pursuant to the agenda of the administration to reduce CO₂ produced by United States by 80 percent, I know that the air was dirtier in 1973, as you said, when you were in high school or what have you, but what this is going

to do is take us back to the 1900s, before the time of cars and X-rays and refrigerators and everything that makes a 21st century life livable for us. That is what this is going to do, if we allow the President's agenda to role forward with the Paris climate accord enshrined and then enacted through the Clean Air Act and section 115.

All this amendment wishes to do and seeks to do is make sure that that statute isn't enacted, per the Paris climate agreement—not a treaty, an agreement—between individuals, not between our countries.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, the debate couldn't be clearer here right now. Either you believe that climate change is real and it presents a clear and present danger—if you read some of the reports from the Department of Defense, they are very concerned about what is going on in the world with food scarcity, with rising sea levels, with all kinds of potential things that could bring real security risks to our Nation. Do we as a country stand up and do something about it and bring other countries with us? My State is not going to be compelled by a foreign government. My State is part of the United States of America, where we will work together under leadership to do something about climate change. Or do we continue to deny that climate change is real? We ignore what the Department of Defense is saying, and the United States doesn't play a clear leadership role in moving forward and bringing people with us on this issue that affects today, tomorrow, future generations and what this planet will be like for our children.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 82 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs Under the Clean Air Act" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on March 14, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 13638 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman

from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds for the EPA's proposed Risk Management Plan rulemaking for the remainder of this year.

This RMP is the EPA's program implementing section 112(r) of the 1990 Clean Air Act that requires facilities that use certain materials to develop a plan to prevent accidental releases.

Safety is at the very core of the chemical industry, and industry stakeholders have worked cooperatively with the EPA to achieve a dramatic 60 percent reduction in accidental releases in the 20 years of the RMP program, to date.

While the EPA has proposed several changes, many of the new regulations they have put forward are highly problematic and could actually lead to an increased likelihood of an incident.

The EPA has raced ahead of the other agencies participating in the Federal interagency working group created to improve chemical safety and security, and it is no longer working in coordination with the other Federal agencies involved in this process.

Yet the EPA is moving to finalize the rule, even though changes planned to OSHA's similar program, the process safety management program, are still in their early stages. This lack of coordination has the potential to create duplicative rules for individuals and companies struggling to comply with multiple Federal oversight programs.

I urge Members to adopt my amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment would block the EPA from finalizing or implementing a proposed rule that establishes accidental release prevention requirements.

Earlier this year, the EPA issued a proposed rule to amend its risk management program regulations response to a 2013 executive order on improving chemical safety. The proposed rule seeks to improve chemical process safety, assist local emergency authorities in planning and responding to accidents, and improve public awareness to chemical hazards at regulated sources.

This is an important regulation and its need was underscored in the tragedy like the one that occurred in 2013 in west Texas, where a massive explosion in a fertilizer plant killed 15 people and injured more than 160.

This amendment would needlessly and recklessly block efforts to further improve chemical safety and security

in coordination with owners and operators, and I strongly oppose that.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 820, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 83, 86, 107, 118, 127, and 129 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by Mr. CALVERT of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out any rule issued after the date of the enactment of this Act that is a major rule described in subparagraph (A) of section 804(2) of title 5, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants pursuant to section 6 of the National Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 5505).

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO OF FLORIDA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF TENNESSEE

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to destroy any buildings or structures on Midway Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN OF ARKANSAS

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior for the purpose of destroying any records regarding, related to, or generated by the Inorganic Section of the United States Geological Survey Energy Geochemistry Laboratory in Lakewood, Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to consult with the National Science Foundation with respect to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 or section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 with respect to any Environmental Impact Statement prepared pursuant to the "Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Initiate Section 106 Consultation for Proposed Changes to Arecibo Observatory Operations, Arecibo, Puerto Rico and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings and Comment Period", published in the Federal Register May 23, 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman

from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1930

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the majority and the minority have agreed to these amendments being offered en bloc. They are amendments that address a variety of issues. Additionally, the sponsors of the amendments have agreed to consideration of these amendments en bloc. I urge the adoption of the amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I just oppose this. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Clean Energy Incentive Program Design Details" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on June 30, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 42939 et seq.), or any rule of the same substance.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to offer a very simple amendment to restrict funding to the EPA for finalizing, implementing, administering, or enforcing its proposed rule called the Clean Energy Incentive Program Design Detail, or CEIP.

As many in this Chamber are aware, the United States Supreme Court issued an historic stay back in February on the EPA's so-called Clean Power Plan, halting the EPA from proceeding on any plans to move forward this harmful and costly regulation, a regulation that would raise household electricity prices by up to 34 percent in some areas of our country.

Despite the Supreme Court ruling, we found that since the stay, the EPA has continued barreling forward, acting as if the Clean Power Plan will most certainly be upheld.

According to the EPA's own documents, the final regulations of the Clean Power Plan already included the CEIP, meaning that the EPA's decision to move forward on its implementation, would, in fact, be unlawful and clearly forbidden by the Supreme Court's stay. Sadly, it is no surprise to many of us that the unelected bureaucrats at the EPA are once again choosing to ignore an order from the highest court in the land, but this amendment will stop the EPA from committing this blatant and unconstitutional violation.

I commend Chairman CALVERT for prohibiting funding to implement the Clean Power Plan in the underlying bill so we can ensure that the will of the Supreme Court and the provisions of the underlying bill are consistent in stopping the regulatory overreach of the EPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the EPA from finalizing or implementing designs and details for the Clean Energy Incentive Program. The Clean Energy Incentive Program is voluntary. It is an option for States. States can choose whether or not to do it. It is not a mandate. The program provides incentives to develop renewable energy and energy efficiency projects.

The amendment is another example of some in the majority's obstruction to anything that the EPA or this administration does to attempt to address climate change. This program is designed to diversify energy supplies used by power generation and provide cleaner power generation to improve air quality. This amendment is a job creator.

Let me highlight again, this program is designed to reward early investments in renewable energy generation and energy efficiency to reduce harmful emissions from electric-generated facilities. Many States have embraced this. Many States are voluntarily moving forward with this.

But this amendment seeks to remove the barriers that we are trying to bring down in low-income communities so that they are able to invest in renewable energy, they are able to help low-income customers reduce their energy bills; and that is what we should be working forward with States and with consumers who want to reduce their energy bills and reduce the effects of climate change.

I want to state again, State participation in this program is totally optional, so this amendment is another

attempt by some in the majority to block any action to address climate change and to continue this Nation's dependency on Big Oil. There is no reason to block a voluntary program from moving forward. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I once again encourage all Members to vote for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Once again, Mr. Chairman, I can't stress enough, the Clean Energy Incentive Program is voluntary.

Why would we tell States that they couldn't choose to participate in something that will help their customers have lower utility bills, help with renewable energy, and help with the environment at the same time?

I urge my colleagues to strongly oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 85 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the third sentence of section 107(f)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607(f)(1)) (relating to use of recovered sums by the United States Government without further appropriation).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, Natural Resource Trustees are Federal officials designated by the President to act on behalf of the public to assess potential damage to natural resources at certain sites.

These trustees are authorized to seek compensation for natural resource damages from responsible parties. Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, CERCLA, these funds collected by trustees are currently not subject to appropriation by Congress.

Unfortunately, in southeast Missouri, we have seen trustees run amuck. They have used money from settlements in places other than where the funds were intended to remedy, essentially resulting in land grabs by the Federal Government.

My amendment would provide congressional oversight in the Natural Resource Damage Assessment process by sending funds collected by the trustees under CERCLA back to the general funds of the Treasury.

This amendment is a necessary step in reining in overreach of the Federal Government and reasserting congressional authority, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the Department of the Interior's ability to conduct damage assessments and inland oil spill preparedness by prohibiting the support of restoration work that is paid for by recovered settlement funds under the Superfund.

In fiscal year 2017, the Department of the Interior will receive nearly \$500 million from the Deepwater Horizon settlement. This amendment would prohibit the distribution of any of those funds to the impacted Gulf States.

The Department's inability to distribute jointly recovered funds to its co-trustees would have a devastating affect on strong Federal, State, Tribal cooperation that the Interior Department has developed over the years, and could lead to a reduction of future joint restoration settlements and a splintering of cooperative restoration efforts among co-trustees, and that would be a travesty.

The amendment could also create uncertainty about its impacts on authorities under CERCLA to retain recovered settlement funds and manage the \$800 million previously recovered in past settlements. This is a reckless amendment with far-reaching impacts.

If the Department of the Interior is unable to effectively administer its Natural Resource Damage Assessment program due to a change in its ability to use appropriated funds, it would likely have a significant effect on NOAA's own ability to effectively manage many of these cases, including the Deepwater Horizon. So I strongly oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It is about making sure elected Members of Congress appropriate funds that are collected under CERCLA instead of being delegated to unelected bureaucrats. It is not reckless. It is being responsible, and it is exerting our Article I authority of the power of the purse.

So I encourage this body to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I believe I have the right to close if the gentleman has no further speakers.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would encourage this body to support this amendment. If they are in support of holding the power of the purse, support the Article I authority to make sure that Congress would actually appropriate the funds instead of an unelected bureaucrat.

This is just bringing back the power that has been delegated in the past and making sure that there is more congressional oversight when this money goes to the U.S. Treasury and that the appropriations process is done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to state again that this would not allow the Department to distribute jointly recovered funds with co-trustees. It would have a devastating effect in the way the Federal, State, and Tribal governments work together and as they have worked together over the years. It could lead to a reduction of joint future restoration settlements and a splintering of cooperation restoration among co-trustees. And when people work together, we have better outcomes, we have better results, and that saves the taxpayers money.

This amendment would clearly limit the Department of the Interior's ability to conduct damage assessments and inland oil spill preparedness by prohibiting the support of restoration work that is paid for by recovered settlement funds under the Superfund. I recommend that the amendment be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 87 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the decision in Civil Action No. 14-1807 (JDB), United States District Court for the District of Columbia, issued March 29, 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of my amendment. My amendment would bar implementation of a Federal court decision issued on March 29, 2016, that stopped implementation of the 2014 U.S. Fish and Wildlife's decision to issue an Environmental Assessment extension for the issuance of depredation permits for double-crested cormorants.

Since 1998, Fish and Wildlife has allowed the issuance of depredation permits for cormorants that threaten commercially raised fish stocks.

In 2003, Fish and Wildlife issued the Public Resource Depredation Order through a final Environmental Impact Statement which allowed for the Federal Government, State officials, and tribal leaders to take cormorants found committing depredations of public supplies of fish.

Environmental Assessments in 2009 and 2014 renewed both of these depredation orders. On March 29, 2016, the U.S. Court for the District of Columbia issued a decision stopping implementation of the 2014 Environmental Assessment extension as a result of a special interest lawsuit.

In the meantime, Fish and Wildlife Service is beginning a new Environmental Assessment, but new depredation permits are not being issued to many farmers whose fish stocks are being depleted by cormorant populations. This is leading to considerable losses for farmers. Farmers are constantly living on the margin and just getting by.

My amendment prevents the use of funds by Fish and Wildlife for the enforcement of the March 29, 2016, court decision. It ensures that a successful depredation program continues so that our farmers continue to farm and feed America.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman CALVERT, for the opportunity to offer this amendment. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. Let's stand up for small farmers in our communities who find themselves under constant pressure economically. They should not have to compete with bad rulings from activist judges.

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

□ 1945

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, in March 2015, the court found the Fish and Wildlife Service had violated

NEPA, in giving an open-ended approval for the lethal removal of the double-crested cormorant, and that they were committing or were about to commit predation on fish, saying that there was not current data or adequate analysis to support this depredation order. The court didn't stop depredation but required a mediation plan.

In May 2016, the court revoked these depredation orders stating that individual permits should be sufficient. The court noted in its decision that the service had ignored environmental benefits of the double-crested cormorants by controlling invasive species fish and economic disruption claims were imprecise, speculative, and not compelling.

This amendment seeks to ignore the findings of the court. In other words, this amendment would tell Fish and Wildlife you don't have to follow what the court said you needed to do, and it prevents the service from using appropriated funds to enforce a court's order on the taking of the double-crested cormorant.

This language does not affect the law's prohibition against the taking of migratory birds, and people who would take the cormorant would knowingly be violating the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and be subject to charges from wildlife officials or other law enforcement agencies.

So the gentleman might not like how the court ruled, but this is the ruling of the court. We are a society that follows the law, and Fish and Wildlife is compelled to comply with the court.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, this is a unique situation where the Fish and Wildlife Service has already begun a new environmental assessment. In the meantime, there are fish farmers who are hurting because of this ruling as they are seeing their stock being eaten by these cormorants, with no recourse to take against them.

These cormorants not only affect fish farmers, they also affect smallmouth bass populations in the Lake States. These farmers should have the right to protect their crops while this new environmental assessment is being put in place, and I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment so that we can stand up for small farmers that are doing their best to feed our country.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 88 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Representatives WESTMORELAND, COLLINS, and SMITH, I offer amendment No. 88.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay legal fees pursuant to a settlement in any case, in which the Federal Government is a party, that arises under—

(1) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(2) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.); or

(3) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if this election cycle has shown us anything, it is that the American people are tired of our officials in Washington, D.C., not listening to the voice of the people. They are tired of a Federal bureaucracy that is accountable to no one and operates in the shadows without proper oversight.

The United States is facing a crisis of executive overreach, and nowhere else is this truer than at the Environmental Protection Agency. The EPA's escalation of sue and settle cases to change the law through Federal Court rulings threatens to shut down American businesses. By operating hand in hand with radical environmentalist groups that are willing participants in the scam, the EPA's use of sue and settle not only endangers the economy, but also our constitutional separation of powers.

According to a 2011 GAO report, between 1995 and 2010, three large environmental activist groups like the Sierra Club received almost \$6 million in attorney fees alone. Under our amendment, no funds can be used to pay legal fees under any settlement regarding any case arising under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act, period. Litigants can still sue, but they will no longer be financially rewarded by the American taxpayer for their efforts.

I am hopeful that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this amendment to reduce the secretive transfer of U.S. tax dollars to private self-interest groups. It is inexcusable to allow this legal collusion.

By restricting Federal agencies from paying attorney fees, we will not only reduce Federal spending, but also reduce the incentive for these self-interest groups to continue suing the Federal Government and taking the American taxpayers' dollars.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment so that Congress can ensure taxpayers are protected from funding the legal efforts of special interest groups and reinforce our constitutional powers.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the Equal Access to Justice Act is the law of the land. It allows for the Federal payment of legal fees—within limits—to individuals, small businesses, and nonprofits where they are the prevailing parties in actions against Federal agencies unless the agency is able to show that the action was substantially justified or that special circumstances make the award unjust. This law helps deter government misconduct and encourages all parties—not just those with resources—to hire legal counsel to assert their rights.

Now, I know my colleagues, including my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, will agree with me that the ability to challenge Federal actions is the most important tool for ensuring government accountability.

The Clean Air Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the Endangered Species Act are also the law of the land. These laws have contributed greatly to the protection and improvement of public health in this country.

A study by the nonpartisan Environmental Law Institute found that the Equal Access to Justice Act has been cost effective, and it only applies to the meritorious litigation and that existing legal safeguards and independent discretion of Federal judges continue to ensure its prudent application.

Here is a fact: the claim that large environmental groups are getting rich on attorney fees is simply not supported by available evidence. In 2011, the GAO did a study. It was requested by House Republicans on cases brought against the EPA. They found that most suits were brought by trade associations and private companies and that attorney fees were awarded only about 8 percent of the time. Among environmental plaintiffs, the majority of cases were brought by local groups rather than national groups. That is just a fact. It is completely unfair to target these important environmental safeguards for removal from the protections of the Equal Access to Justice Act.

But more importantly, this amendment would have a serious consequence on the public health. In order for our Nation's environmental safeguards to work properly and ensure the protection of public health, citizens—including those citizens with limited means—must have the ability to challenge Federal action. The Smith amendment is clearly designed to make it more difficult for citizens—every citizen—to ensure the accountability of the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may con-

sume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this amendment offered by my colleague from Georgia. The Constitution grants the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to Congress, not the executive branch. Yet many executive branch agencies are using sue and settle techniques to circumvent the rule-making process to enact overly broad and costly regulations, without any input or comment from the public.

One of the worst offenders is the EPA, which has increasingly relied on outside special interest groups to bring lawsuits demanding expanded regulations. And the EPA is all too willing to settle immediately.

My colleague's amendment would restrict the use of taxpayer dollars from paying the legal fees of these outside groups when suing the Federal Government under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, or the Endangered Species Act.

This amendment does not prohibit affected parties from bringing these lawsuits, but restricting agencies' ability to pay attorney fees will reduce the incentive of using lawsuits as a way to expand the power of the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, I have the right to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as the young lady across the aisle made note of the GAO report of 2011, also in that same report, as I noted, is that that report recognized that environmentalist groups such as the Sierra Club received almost \$6 million in settlement fees from just suing the government. Under no circumstances should the government be rewarding any group to sue the government on their behalf. They definitely don't do that to every individual citizen and to every small-business owner that is being targeted by the EPA where they are being targeted by other Federal agencies. This is about fairness, and this is making sure that self-interest groups are not profiting off of the Federal Government.

I encourage the body to support the amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state again that the GAO report clearly found that most suits were brought by trade associations and private companies and that attorney fees were only awarded about 8 percent of the time, and among environmental plaintiffs, the majority of those cases were brought by local groups rather than national groups.

So this amendment is clearly designed to make it much more difficult for citizens—my constituents—to ensure that there is accountability in the Federal Government so that they can have their day in court with being a plaintiff against the government when they feel it necessary.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 89 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf-Requirements for Exploratory Drilling on the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf" as published February 24, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 9916).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prevents funds from this act from being used to finalize, implement, or enforce the new Arctic regulations the Department of the Interior rushed to last week.

In addition to the billions of dollars already spent—\$7 billion—to develop these sales, these regulations would cost an additional \$2 billion for the oil and gas industry.

This regulation is nothing more than a tactic to lock safe Arctic energy development up in red tape because exploration would become full of unnecessary operational burdens.

The National Petroleum Council Arctic report found that Arctic resources

can be safely developed today using existing, field-proven technology. Locking up Arctic resources only hurts our Nation by preventing responsible energy development.

I ask my colleagues to support the State of Alaska, stand up for the Alaskan Natives of the North Slope who support this production in energy exploration, and vote “yes” on my amendment.

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

□ 2000

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. This amendment would block the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management from finalizing regulations that deal with exploratory drilling on the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf that has conducted mobile oil offshore drilling units. Oil and gas exploration on the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf is expensive and requires industry to make significant investments. Blocking this rule creates uncertainty for industry and other stakeholders. Delaying or inhibiting implementation of this rule will likely defer, rather than encourage, future Arctic exploration and development.

The amendment would also undermine efforts to protect Alaska Natives' health, livelihood, and cultural traditions. As we know, there are Alaska Natives that do have grave concerns about what is going on with oil drilling and exploration in Alaska.

The impact of a catastrophic oil spill would have extremely high cultural and societal costs to these Native Alaskans. The amendment would derail efforts to set specialized safety requirements and environmental precautions to account for the extreme environmental conditions, geography, and remoteness, like to fix infrastructure in existing operations in the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf.

The amendment stands in the way of efforts to reduce the risk of oil spill in an extreme sensitive environment where responding to any spill may be beyond current oil spill response capabilities. We need to protect our precious Arctic resources and ensure that they are managed responsibly.

Therefore, I must oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the young lady that the Natives of Alaska on the North Slope support this legislation. They want the development. They have talked about it. They have been really working close with the oil industry as partners. I think we ought to accept the fact that they are the most affected. If they want it, we ought to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I think this is something where people clearly in this Chamber know that the gentleman from Alaska and I are going to disagree on.

I will state for the RECORD that I have spoken with many Native Alaskans who do oppose this, so they are not all of one mind throughout Alaska on this issue. They are concerned about the effect an oil spill would have on their coastal and societal costs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 90 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska for which notice of availability was published in the Federal Register on April 13, 2015 (80 Fed. 19678).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prevents funds from this act being used to implement a Department of the Interior management plan for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, which designates the entirety as wilderness.

This would include the 1002 area that was set aside by Congress for potential development in the future, an area that holds 10 billion barrels of oil at the minimum and probably 37 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

I am trying to do this because we already did this act. In the Alaska National Lands Act, we set that area aside. Now the Department that regulates it is trying to make it all wilderness with no drilling to take place.

I ask for a “yes” vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise, respectfully, in opposition to this amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Alaska.

This amendment would block the implementation of the Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Arctic Na-

tional Wildlife Refuge, a plan that will already have been in place for nearly 2 years by the time this language will take effect and a plan that received broad support upon its implementation.

At more than 19 million acres, the Arctic Refuge is one of the crown jewels of our Nation's public lands, and like Yellowstone and the Grand Canyon before it, this iconic landscape deserves to be protected for generations to come.

Included in the CCP is a recommendation for expanded wilderness designations which nearly 1 million people from all 50 States—including native, faith-based, business, and conservation groups—have submitted comments of support for.

The Arctic Refuge's Coastal Plain is the biological heart of the refuge, which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service calls the “center for wildlife activity.”

The plan's current wilderness recommendation would ensure that these pristine habitats will remain intact for future generations. This is critical to supporting native wildlife and maintaining traditional and subsistence activities on the refuge.

Since President Eisenhower established the Arctic National Wildlife Range, Members of both parties have stood up to protect this truly unique national treasure. Republican Senator William Roth introduced the first bill to designate the refuge's Coastal Plain as wilderness in 1987.

A bill to protect this place as wilderness has been introduced every Congress since. And this Congress, 128 Members from both sides of the aisle have pledged their support.

I have the utmost respect for my friend and colleague Mr. YOUNG. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that this was an act of Congress that set aside the 1002 area by the Senator from Washington State. That is crucially important because it is an area that has great potential 74 miles away from the existing pipeline. It also is an area that has the Village of Kaktovik that supports the drilling and development in 1002.

I am just saying that no agency has a right to overcome a law of the Congress. I am not talking about the 19 million acres. I am talking about the small acreage, a parcel no bigger than the Dulles Airport, to allow that to be continued to be considered by the Congress of the United States, who set it aside at the insistence of Scoop Jackson from Washington State with the help of Senator Ted Stevens and myself, for potential drilling. It has to have an act of Congress, but you can't drill in a wilderness area.

So I am saying no money shall be spent. No regulatory agency can turn

and make it an off-limits area to develop the oil if this Congress so decides.

I urge a “yes” on my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman.

My friend from Alaska is correct. The ultimate decision and the final disposition of this incredible place is up to the Congress of the United States. However, the question before us now is how should this area be managed until Congress finally resolves this issue?

I am proud to have authored an amendment a few months back that showed that there is bipartisan support in the House for a final wilderness determination. I believe eventually that bipartisan support will be a majority of the Congress. But in the meantime, those of us that are working to protect this very important iconic place know that we are expressing the voice of the American people.

Nearly 1 million people commented in support of the wilderness recommendation. These are people from all 50 States. It includes Native Americans. It includes Native Alaskans. It includes people from the faith community, the business community, and the environmental community. This is a uniquely important place with wildlife that, in many cases, are not found anywhere else and with a connection for all of us because the migratory bird species that spend part of their lives in the Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge travel to almost all 50 States in other parts of their life stage.

We all have a stake in this. We need to do the right thing. I believe the administration is doing the right thing by managing this area as wilderness while we continue to work on an act of Congress that will settle this longstanding question.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that most people don't know what they are talking about. We follow the laws of the Congress. We should. I respectfully suggest that I am not suggesting the whole—and I am not supporting it right now—the Arctic Wildlife Range, I am talking about 100,000 acres of land that we set aside—the Congress. The Senate agreed to it. The conference agreed to it. And here we are trying to let a regulatory agency tell us how to manage it. That is inappropriate.

I listened to another gentleman on this floor today talking about over-regulation of the EPA. That is what is wrong with this Nation today, is regulatory law allowing the executive branch to run this Nation without the people's voice being heard. That is what is happening here.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to be up in this area, and this protected area en-

compasses a wide range of Arctic and sub-Arctic ecosystems. The native flora and fauna is magnificent. The refuge is incredible with its biological diversity.

I understand that the gentleman from Alaska feels strongly about this issue in a way that I feel differently about and that he has been an advocate for his State for decades, but on this important issue, we just simply disagree.

Lastly, I would be remiss if I didn't point out one more obvious truth. The President will not sign a bill loaded up with anti-environmental riders just like this one. We only make our path for this bill harder by including it. I hope my colleagues would join me in opposing it.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska will be postponed.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the World War I Centennial Commission.

The United States entered World War I in 1917. More than 4 million Americans served in the Great War, including 350,000 African Americans and the first woman ever to enlist in the United States Armed Forces.

In order to properly commemorate and celebrate the brave service these Americans gave to us, the World War I Centennial Commission was established by this body in 2013. In addition to the memorial, the Commission is responsible for planning and executing educational and commemorative activities.

I ask the Chair and ranking member to work with me as this bill progresses to find the necessary resources for the Commission to do its work. While it is true that there are no World War I veterans still among us, their sacrifice must not be forgotten.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I pledge to work with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I understand and share the gentleman's interest in the World War I Centennial Commission. The committee may be willing to consider funds for the Commission to carry out its mis-

sion, but we need to make sure that the process is open and transparent.

Report language accompanying this bill encourages the Commission to submit a budget request in the future so that we might review it in detail. The Commission will serve as the lead organizer for the Nation's commemorative event so that America can tell the story of the Great War that profoundly shaped our history.

I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that the work of the Commission is important and look forward to working with the gentleman on this issue.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2015

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 91 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service—

(1) to issue a final rule for the proposed regulations listed under docket number FWS-R7-NWRS-2014-0005; or

(2) to implement the final rule entitled “Alaska; Hunting and Trapping in National Preserves” and dated (80 Fed. Reg. 64325 (October 23, 2015)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits the funds in this act from being used to issue the final rule by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, which would seize authority away from the Alaskan Fish and Game of the State of Alaska to manage fish and wildlife for both nonsubsistence and subsistence uses on Federal wildlife refuges in Alaska. In addition, this amendment prohibits funds to be used on the existing National Park Service rule that interferes with State wildlife management authority on national preserve lands, which is guaranteed hunting under the Alaska National Lands Act in Alaska.

The two rules in question violate the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, the ANILCA, passed by Congress and signed into law in 1980, which protects the ability of the State

of Alaska to manage wildlife across the State on State, private, and Federal lands. This Chamber voted in favor of a similar amendment and this language in the sportsmen's package, H.R. 2604, back in February.

These regulations are nothing more than an illegal overreach of the Federal Government on the State of Alaska. It is agreed in the Constitution, and it is in the law that they manage all fish and game on all lands in the State of Alaska.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I stand to strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment would block Federal rules aimed at protecting wolves, wolverines, black bears, grizzly bears, and lynx from some of the most egregious hunting and killing methods. These methods include shooting defenseless, swimming caribou from motorboats; using airplanes to scout and shoot grizzly bears; luring grizzlies with rotting meat and pet food to get a point-blank kill; killing wolf, black bear, and coyote mothers and their dependent pups and cubs at their dens; and the trapping of grizzly and black bears with steel-jawed leg-hold traps and wire snares. These methods are inhumane and contrary to our values here in this great country.

We should support the scientists, rangers, and wildlife managers in the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service in their efforts to maintain healthy ecosystems.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and strike this poison pill rider from this bill. These are egregious things that we should not tolerate, and we should not codify them in law.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disappointed in the comments that were just made because all he said was not true. The State does not den; the State does not snare; the State does not trap; the State does not kill wantonly. The State manages. To have the Federal Government manage the game when it is the law and when it is in the Constitution of the State of Alaska—an agreement made with this body—and to have an agency take that over and with the propaganda that has been espoused on this floor from the Humane Society is inappropriate of this body. It is a flat-out lie. That is what it is. It is not true.

The State manages, and they have not used these practices, but they have a right and should have a right to manage the fish and game on the property which was guaranteed to us.

I understand where this pressure is coming from. We in Alaska face this every day. No one understands that we have people in Alaska and that we have natives in Alaska who actually want the State to manage their fish and game or who would like to manage it by themselves, which I do support; but to have the Federal Government come in is wrong, and it is against our Constitution. I will stand by this amendment to stop moneys being spent by an agency that has overreached.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I respect the concern of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and his advocacy for his State, but I oppose this proposal which, in this case, does not present an opportunity for a balanced approach to wildlife management. Let me clarify why the National Wildlife Refuge is proposing these rules.

According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, certain types of inhumane hunting, such as bear baiting and den hunting, has affected Federal refuge areas for wildlife. In fact, one refuge in the Kenai Peninsula had an emergency closing due to the extreme decrease in the number of brown bears, which was caused by these inhumane hunting practices.

Rather than shutting down areas in which these hunting methods are causing the overkilling of native Alaskan predators and restricting access to all hunters, it seems reasonable to me to provide for a balanced approach that provides for a means of traditional, permit-based hunting.

Nothing in the rule of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service would limit traditional hunting tactics, but, rather, it would continue and protect existing hunting practices. Unfortunately, this amendment does not address the wildlife diversity and mechanisms in place to maintain it. Therefore, it impacts the National Wildlife Refuge's ability to maintain its parks in a responsible manner and provide native animals with a refuge.

We as Members of Congress have a Federal responsibility to ensure that our National Wildlife Refuges are being used in the most responsible manner possible. The very agency Congress has vested with the responsibility to manage our wildlife thinks these killing tactics pose a threat to the necessary diversity of the wildlife, and I agree with them.

I urge my colleagues to support the ability of the Fish and Wildlife Service to effectively manage our National Wildlife Refuges for future generations of Americans. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the gentleman.

I will say, though, that all of these instances that have been referred to have not happened under State management. I suggest, respectfully, that the Fish and Wildlife is no longer a manager of fish and wildlife. They have become people who prohibit activity on the refuges. That was not why these refuges were made. They were made by the people who hunt and fish, and now we are having other groups that say this is inhumane, which has nothing to do with it.

I am a little bit shocked that we are reading the thing from the Humane Society, PETA, and all of these other groups. Those are not the true facts. I ask the gentleman to, please, look at the true facts.

Management is crucial to the State of Alaska. As I mentioned before, we ought to really think about, maybe, management by the native corporations on their lands, too; but in having the Federal Government manage, it has done a miserable job of the management of game. Their idea of management is to just leave them walking around and to let nature take care of it. I happen to know a little bit about nature, and it doesn't take care of it. We are just talking about management, and the State has that right under its constitution; so I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment circumvents the established rulemaking process, which solicits public input and uses the best available science to reach a decision. Alaska's aggressive predatory control practices and disregard for science-based management in the approach of the Service would negatively impact the stability of the ecosystems and wildlife throughout the region.

Thirty-one biologists and scientists stated on March 28, 2016, in a letter to Interior Secretary Jewell and Service Director Ash:

The most current and best available science is clear that predator control measures that are intended to restore the herd, such as moose and caribou, are doomed to failure because the herds need to access nutrition. Their main limiting factor is Alaska's intensive management scheme, which is the wrong approach to conserving natural systems.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 92 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to remove Arctic Sales 255, 258, and 262 from the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Program for which notice of availability was published on March 18, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 14881).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It prevents funding from this act to be used to remove 3 Arctic Sales that have already taken place from the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Program.

The economic benefits that would be associated with offshore development in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas are tremendous. In those two areas alone, we have the potential to produce about 23.6 billion barrels of oil and 104 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Potentially creating 54,700 jobs nationwide will generate billions of dollars in revenue for the State and local governments. May I suggest, respectfully, that this money can be used in conservation efforts, in land and water conservation funds. You can't have that program without the development of oil; yet everybody I know on that side supports the program.

The second thing is, if I can say one thing, we sit with our heads in the sand when, across the border, China and the other nations are developing. We must, in fact, be part players of this program. We need to do it wisely and to do it safely and to do it for the benefit of the American people.

Now, if you don't believe in fossil fuels, I understand that, but there is no way that we are not going to be using fossil fuels for many years to come. If we are to do so, let's use that which is safe. We have already proven it can be done safely in the Arctic. It is not the frontier that people think it is. It is 150 feet deep. If we don't do this off our shores, it will be done by foreign countries.

I am asking the Department of the Interior not to withdraw those sales. It means money to the Treasury; it means we have less of a dependence on foreign oil; and it means we will be actively involved. When other countries are involved, we will be there with our equipment, and we will be able to have an oil spill recovery if they spill the oil, because they will not. I know how the parties play in this. We will. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would mandate that the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management include specific areas in the Alaska region of the Outer Continental Shelf in its 2017–2022 lease schedule. This amendment would undermine the Bureau's fundamental mission to manage the development of offshore resources in an environmentally and economically responsible manner.

The 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Program was proposed in March of this year, and the public comment only closed a few weeks ago. The Bureau is required by law to consider the environmental impacts of the leasing decision. This includes a comprehensive Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. It is inappropriate to circumvent this process.

Lease sales should be informed by sound science and by using the best data available. This amendment would violate multiple environmental statutes, including NEPA, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Coastal Zone Management Act. The amendment undermines the environmental protection that is required by law. Therefore, I must oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, these leases were put up for lease in 2017–2022. We are not asking for any additional new leases. We are asking for the leases that remain in the sales. Then we address the environmental issue as the sales take place before we have development. I am suggesting, respectfully, if we don't have those areas open, the 3 Arctic Sale areas, then the leases will not be issued in any other area.

Oil is not where you want it to be—it is where it is. I am saying we can address all of the issues the gentleman is concerned with after the sales take place and we receive the money. If it can't be done safely, it can be stopped at that time. This happened with Shell.

I am just saying not to let an agency or an administration get ahead of itself and say, "Oh, we are going to take the leases back." That is the prerogative of an agency, yes; but the leases were put up to begin with, so we ought to take and accept that. Let's go through the process, and the process will follow through. Then we will decide on the environmental impact, on the culture. Then we will have the way to do it right and correctly.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, obviously, we disagree once again.

My concern is that this amendment would mandate the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to include specific areas in the 2017–2022 lease sale schedule and that the Bureau needs to up-

hold the law. It is required to follow the law and to consider the environmental impacts of leasing decisions. This amendment would also violate, as I pointed out, quite a few statutes: NEPA, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Therefore, I must oppose the amendment.

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

□ 2030

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 93 printed in House Report 114–683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior to require changes to an existing placer mining plan of operations with regard to reclamation activities, including revegetation, or to modify the bond requirements for the mining operation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. This is an area called the Forty Mile Mining District area in the State of Alaska that has been mined since 1895.

There was an attempt by the BLM to go in and stop this mining. These are not large mines. These are mom-and-pop operations, placer operations. They put down ridiculous regulations and reclamation now, and they want them to reclaim the land back to the original state before it was ever mined, not of the disturbance of the mining they were doing. It is amazing to me that they would even think about doing this.

I am talking about people who have been there for 20 years, most of them retired. They are really, if I have to say anything, the mom-and-pops of Alaska; they are the spirit of Alaska.

All of a sudden, they have a big agency coming in and saying: You have to

have a reclamation area, and this is the way that we want it done.

Yet, they don't recognize what has been done in the past and how it has worked. What they are proposing is wrong, and it costs a considerable amount of money to these small mom-and-pop miners.

One of our big plaques in the State of Alaska is the gold pan. Yet, we have this agency coming in for 140 acres. That is all they are talking about. For some reason, they got an idea that we want to put them out of business.

I am just saying, no, they should not impose these regulations. Follow the State mining law, and the reclamation that takes place now works. Let them continue to do that, and we can reclaim the land. They are agreeable to that. They just can't do what they are asking them to do because they can't afford to do it. It is that simple.

This is a simple amendment to try and protect mom-and-pop operations in the State of Alaska like you would do in your State for any other operation where the Federal Government is coming in and trying to take it away.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, most of the 186 active mining operations on the BLM—these are Federal managed lands in Alaska—are placer mining operations.

Between 4 and 800 miles of BLM Federal managed streams have historic or active placer mining impacts, and there is a legacy of historic claims with reduced ecosystem function.

Now, BLM continues various outreach activities, including public meetings and interactions with individual miners, and is working with industry to incorporate best practice management and to use new science-based reclamation techniques to accelerate stream recovery.

I hear what the gentleman is saying about State lands and State recovery. And what the State of Alaska chooses to do with recovery in its own State boundaries is one thing, but these are Federal lands. In the course of reclamation activities, it may be necessary to increase an annual cost to miners to recover these streams and restore the ecosystem function.

The amendment prohibits assessing the cost of reclaiming these areas to placer miners who are profiting from Federal mineral extraction on federally managed lands, BLM lands. So the taxpayers all across this country should not be shouldering the burden of these restoring costs. The responsible party should. So that is why I strongly oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest one thing to the

gentlewoman; we are only talking about 49 families. This is small. I am not talking about all the other placer mining. This is, in fact, the Forty Mile Miners. I mean, they have been there forever.

Like I say, you can go there and it is like looking into a museum of 1859. And they are patented claims. It is their land. A lot of it is State land.

They are claiming it because it is placer mining. The BLM is claiming they have the authority to impose a reclamation system that does not work.

Did they consult? No.

I am just saying, keep in mind that we are not talking about corporations. We are not talking about large industry. We are talking about, very frankly, if you go up there—and I wish you would—you will find out they are a pretty good group of older Alaskans, some hippies. We still have a few of those left. And they are not making any money.

This is an occupation, but if they have to do what the BLM is suggesting they do—by the way, there are fish in that stream now, and it was mined in 1895. What they are asking, it will break them. They can't do it, and you will say good.

Well, that is taking people—this is a huge area, the total area. That, I am not arguing. I am just talking about this little Forty Mile group. So give them a break. Let them go out and make enough money to buy Saturday night party time.

I urge the passage of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alaska has convinced me of one thing: I need to go back to Alaska, and I need to spend some time with you there.

I still oppose this amendment. The American taxpayer should not be accepting the burden of restoration costs to make sure that these waterways are reclaimed to how they should be.

I continue to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 820, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 108, 109, 110, 112, 115, 117, 121, 124, 125, and 126 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by Mr. CALVERT of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER OF OREGON

Page 16, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. CLYBURN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 16, lines 4 and 24, after each dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN OF TENNESSEE

Page 16, lines 4 and 23, after each dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 72, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 81, line 18, insert "or if a Federal or State emergency declaration has been issued due to a threat to public health from heightened exposure to lead in a municipal drinking water supply before the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That in a State in which such an emergency declaration has been issued, the State may use more than 20 percent of the funds made available under this title to the State for Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants to provide additional subsidy to eligible recipients" before the semicolon at the end.

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 120, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$300,000) (increased by \$300,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 121 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act for the "DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR—NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION" may be used in contravention of section 320101 of title 54, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to eliminate the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership.

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PIN-GREE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the majority and the minority have agreed to these amendments en bloc. They are noncontroversial amendments that affect a variety of issues. Additionally, the sponsors of the amendments have agreed to consideration of these amendments en bloc.

I urge adoption of the amendments. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Maine, the ranking member, and the chairman of the subcommittee for their kindness and their support of the Jackson Lee amendments.

Let me indicate that in the sum total of my amendments, amendments Nos. 124, 125, and 126, my amendments promote support for national historic areas in our Nation, promote partnership strategies in preserving our urban life refuges, and promote outreach programs by the Smithsonian Institution on the fantastic historical and artistic knowledge of our Smithsonian houses, which facilitate an appreciation for America all over the world.

In particular, my amendment No. 124 is an amendment that expresses support for the national historic areas and for the continuation of a national policy of preserving for public use historic sites, buildings, and other objects of national significance.

My amendment No. 125 is an amendment that would prohibit the use of funds to eliminate the urban wildlife refuge partnership. Additionally, there is an amendment that would prohibit the use of funds to limit outreach administered by the Smithsonian.

The idea behind these three amendments is to, again, recognize the great history of this Nation, even as young as this country is. In particular, in my congressional district, we have Freedmen's Town that had Camp Logan. It was a place of freed African American slaves, which grew into an amazing community. In addition, the Allen Brothers, who founded Houston, are buried in that same neighborhood.

In addition to that, we have something called the Juneteenth Trail. That is the trail the slaves traveled from Galveston up to Houston. The trail has an enormous amount of history, and that is part of the history of celebrating Juneteenth. To preserve that history is very important.

In the second amendment, I want to make sure that we maintain a program that helps and introduces urban youth to the wonders of wildlife and historic preservation.

Finally, I think it is important that we recognize the historic importance of the Smithsonian and continue to emphasize its outreach capacity to ensure that it reaches Americans of all levels to speak about the story of this great Nation.

My amendments, again, ask these simple questions: Is our history worthy of knowing, studying, and preserving?

It is.

Is it important to work with our State and local governments to help them preserve their history?

My amendments answer that question by supporting policies that will work with State and local governments that will reach out to urban youth so they can understand the wildlife preservation through the urban wildlife refuge programs, and then, of course, the Smithsonian that provides an eye to the history of this Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support Jackson Lee amendment Nos. 124, 125, and 126 in the en bloc amendment.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for making in order Jackson Lee Amendments Number 124, along with my other Amendments Number 125 and Number 126 to H.R. 5538—"Department of the Interior and the Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2017."

I also commend Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this measure to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chair, in sum, my Amendment promotes support for National Historic Areas in our nation.

Indeed, among other agencies, this measure funds the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park System, and the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums including the National Zoo.

Most Americans do not know that this measure also funds a very special agency, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and its adjunct, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Mr. Chair, the Jackson Lee Amendments are simple because they send a very important message from the Congress of the United States: that we value tradition, that we think about the impact of history and tradition on future generations to come and that if we recognize and know our history, we are able to work together as an American family in the spirit of respect, unity and growth.

Specifically, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 124 encourages us to preserve history, whereby the National Historic Preservation Fund and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation are charged to redouble their efforts to assist state and local governments and community groups in identifying and working to preserve nationally significant sites, structures, and artifacts, for example those relating to communities founded by newly emancipated slaves, such as Freedmen's Town in home District of Houston, Texas.

Indeed, just west of downtown Houston lies the Fourth Ward.

It is the city's oldest African American community, but before it was the Fourth Ward, this community was known by its original name, Freedmen's Town, given by freed slaves who settled it shortly after receiving the news of their emancipation on Juneteenth.

Freedmen's Town prospered during the turn of the century.

Economic, community, and social development were at a peak until local government became threatened by the prosperity of this area and its residents.

In the 1920's, Freedmen's Town was the "Harlem of the Southwest."

The area was filled with many restaurants, jazz spots, and night clubs.

As the years passed and with the coming of integration, many of Freedmen's Town residents began to move towards Texas Southern University, in the Third Ward, and other areas of the city.

Freedmen's Town has a rich and colorful past and is still home to many significant historical landmarks and features.

It was famous for its hand laid brick streets, constructed by Houston's Rev. Jeremiah Smith and his congregation over half a century ago.

Houston's first cemetery, Founder's Cemetery at Valentine and West Dallas, contains the graves of military men who fought in the Civil War, as well as the historical remains of John and Augustus Allen, the founders of Houston.

Behind Founder's Cemetery lies Congregation Beth Israel, the oldest Jewish cemetery in Houston, which is beautifully maintained to this day.

Among other historical churches in the area, Antioch Missionary Baptist Church built in 1866 continues to be a major focal point of Freedmen's Town, though it has been relocated from its original site on "Baptist Hill" where the Music Hall and Coliseum now stand.

Rev. John Jack Yates, the first Black pastor of Antioch, was a dynamic and influential leader known for his deep commitment to the education of Black youngsters.

He often used his personal finances to send Freedmen's Town children to school.

Today, Jack Yates High School in the Third Ward stands in his honor.

Although Freedmen's Town is a nationally registered historical site, and the largest intact freed slave settlement left in the entire nation, its official designation protects only 40 of the 80 blocks or more of the remaining Freedmen's Town area.

To preserve what remains of Freedmen's Town will require the combined efforts of community groups working with local, state, and federal government to reach a consensus of projects worthy of preservation.

One such project for Freedmen's Town is the "Bricks Street Project," which is intended to preserve the original brick pavers of Freedmen's Town along Andrews Street and Wilson Street.

These streets were found to contain brick pavers patterns which may be unique to the Freedmen's Town area, and are consistent with brick patterns seen on architectural features located in the Historic District.

Mr. Chair, hearts break when irreplaceable structures are destroyed or damaged beyond repair, instead of preserved and protected as they deserve.

A plaque pointing out "on this site a great building once stood" simply cannot tell the story in whole or in full.

Equally tragic is the loss of traditions: a way of living or crafting wood or farming, of celebrating holidays or worshipping or feasting on "Juneteenth" cuisine.

The preservation of artifacts as well as traditions is important to telling the story of the people who settled a community.

Thus, I urge support for Jackson Lee Amendment Number 124.

Mr. Chair, I would also like to thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for making in order Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125 to H.R. 5538—"Department of the Interior and the Environment

and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2017.”

I also comment Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this measure to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chair, in sum, my Amendment promotes partnership strategies in preserving our urban wildlife refuges.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125 prohibits the utilization of funds to eliminate Urban Wildlife and Refugee Partnerships.

According to some estimates, 80 percent of the U.S. population currently resides in urban communities, and the challenge before us is ensuring our natural resources are conserved and valued by the American people and that our youth are beneficiaries of Urban Wildlife and Refugee partnerships.

Thus, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125 works to facilitate the nurturing and education of Americans, especially our youth on the imperative of exposure to urban wildlife and refugee facilities across our nation.

Picture this: nature meets skyline near Houston’s Buffalo Bayou, one of many sites where Texas works with Houston Wilderness to create shared conservation messages and strategies.

Indeed, I commend the work of the Houston Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership, in Texas.

Additionally, the Texas Mid-Coast Refuge Complex will work with Houston Wilderness, an alliance of business, environmental and government interests, to create a coordinated conservation presence in the metro area.

Moreover, young people deserve exposure to the educational opportunities and excitement these urban wildlife and refugee parks have to offer, where their minds are developed and enriched; indeed, where they get to interact with and see wildlife they have read about in their school books.

Urban wildlife and refugee parks spark creativity in a healthy dose for the imagination of our young people so that they have an appreciation of nature and all the beautiful inhabitants it offers us.

From Houston, to Rhode Island to Baltimore, to Chicago and everywhere in between, young people have the opportunity to spearhead replanting projects along various rivers; learn about birding and be partners and stakeholders in their communities’ parks and zoos while also sharpening their minds.

For all these reasons, I urge support for Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125.

Mr. Chair, I would also like to thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for making in order Jackson Lee Amendment Number 126 to H.R. 5538—“Department of the Interior and the Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2017.”

I also commend Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this measure to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chair, in sum, my Amendment promotes outreach programs by the Smithsonian Institution on the fantastic historical and artistic knowledge our Smithsonian houses and facilities an appreciation for America and the world over.

Specifically, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 126 prohibits funds to be utilized to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

As I mentioned earlier, the Smithsonian Institution operates as our national museum and

attracts not only Americans and American youth but also dignitaries from across the globe, from Africa to Asia to Europe and everywhere in-between.

Indeed, our historical Smithsonian Institution has attracted intellectuals, kings, dignitaries and youth from across the country and others who have come from afar to witness in person the diversity of the art housed in our Smithsonian Institution, the world’s largest museum and research complex which includes 19 museums and galleries and the National Zoological Park.

No doubt, these Museums have enriched our lives: the African American History and Culture Museum, African Art Museum, the Air and Space Museum, the Air and Space Museum Udvar-Hazy Center, American Art Museum, the American History Museum, the American Indian Museum, Anacostia Community Museum, the Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Freer Gallery of Art, Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, the National Zoo, the Natural History Museum, the Portrait Gallery, Postal Museum and the Renwick Gallery.

By promoting and protecting the buildings, landscape, special places and qualities that enrich and captivate the exceptional American imagination, attracting visitors from across the globe, we preserve our history for future generations to come and educate the general public about American history.

For all these reasons, I urge support for Jackson Lee Amendment Number 126.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of the committee and subcommittee for their work on this very important issue.

This en bloc amendment includes two amendments that I offered that would provide specific relief to my hometown. Many of you have heard me on the floor of this House talk about the incredible challenge that my hometown of Flint, Michigan, faces.

Through no fault of its own, during a time when a State-appointed emergency manager was literally running every aspect of city government, a terrible decision, a thoughtless and really not science-based decision was made to use river water to replace water from the Great Lakes as the drinking water source. That decision caused a series of events that led to lead leaching into the water and, quite literally, poisoning a city of 100,000 people. The impact of this event will be long felt in my hometown.

We all have an obligation. Even though the principal responsibility lies with the State, we all have an obligation to contribute to the efforts that this city will painfully go through in order to recover. The amendments within this en bloc amendment that I offered will help.

The committee has already done great work to provide some flexibility to States in administering the clean drinking water revolving loan fund, the state revolving loan fund, which in this

case would provide the State of Michigan with tools to assist the City of Flint in making the kinds of changes to its water system to prevent this from ever happening again and correct the problem in the first place.

There is another amendment that would actually allow the city some help in transitioning to a permanent water source derived from Lake Huron and away from dependence on either the Detroit water system or this river water, which was the source of the problem.

I will just say this: It will take a lot more to fix this problem and a lot of commitment from the State and the Federal Government, but it means a lot to the people back home.

I just want to express my gratitude to the ranking member and to Chairman CALVERT for their work on this. It will help my hometown of Flint, but it will also potentially be of value to other communities facing water emergencies.

I urge my colleagues to support this en bloc amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support the en bloc amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman CALVERT for supporting this amendment as well as my friend, Ranking Member MCCOLLUM. Thank you to you both.

Mr. Chair, this amendment reduces the Smithsonian Institution account on page 120, line 23, of the bill by \$300,000, and then increases it by the same amount. The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center receives a \$300,000 increase over last year’s enacted funding amount, consistent with the President’s request in his fiscal year 2017 budget.

The Congressional Budget Office scored this amendment as budget neutral, and more than enough money exists in the \$515,000 increase to the Smithsonian’s ‘Administration’ account, which funds the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center, to accomplish the goal of my amendment.

Frankly speaking, I do not care where the Committee, or the Board of Regents, wish to reallocate funds from, I only wish to seek assurance that the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center will receive the \$300,000 increase it so justly deserves. Thank you again, Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM, for agreeing to this funding level moving forward.

According to the Smithsonian’s budget justification to Congress, these additional funds will be used to provide for the salaries and benefits of one associate program director, one curator for Asian Pacific studies, and one education coordinator.

With the addition of three additional staff, the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center will be able to continue to serve as the leading voice on the Asian Pacific American experience, as well as host events in cities across the country.

Mr. Chair, I believe the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center deserves our support, and I thank everyone in this Chamber this evening for agreeing with me.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

□ 2045

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 94 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to declare a national monument under section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, in the exclusive economic zone of the United States established by Proclamation Numbered 5030, dated March 10, 1983.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to bar funding for the creation of any national marine monuments in the EEZ through Presidential proclamation. I do this on behalf of commercial fishermen on Long Island and throughout the Nation who, like so many other hardworking Americans, are increasingly under assault from the executive overreach of this administration.

This amendment uses the power of the purse to ensure the President does not abuse the Antiquities Act to lock out commercial fishermen from portions of the EEZ that contain essential fisheries. Any efforts to create a marine-protected area must be done through the transparent process laid out by Magnuson-Stevens, not through executive fiat that threatens to put thousands of hardworking men and women out of business.

The Antiquities Act has been an effective tool in the past to preserve historic sites like the Statue of Liberty, but the overly broad interpretation of this law held by the current administration is threatening to shut down thousands of square miles of ocean from fishing through a Presidential proclamation.

In the northwest Atlantic, ocean fishermen from my district and throughout this region work in some of the most productive fishing areas in the world. This area is currently under consideration for a marine monument designation with little public input and zero transparency. The concerns regarding the marine monument designations reach nationwide, where the administration's closed and secretive process have left fishermen and regional fishery managers extremely concerned.

Recent marine monument designations proclaimed by the Obama administration have been the largest in U.S. history, locking out all fishing in perpetuity, a severe departure from the original intent of the Antiquities Act to preserve historical sites and archaeological treasures.

Mr. Chairman, protecting the seafood economy, coastal communities, and the hardworking men and women who provide for their families through commercial fishing is a top priority for my constituents on the east end of Long Island.

I would like to thank Chairman CALVERT and Chairman BISHOP for their support of this amendment to rein in executive overreach on behalf of America's fishermen. I urge all my colleagues to support this critical amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, since Theodore Roosevelt's designation of our first national monument, Devil's Tower in Wyoming, 16 Presidents from both parties have used the Antiquities Act to protect more than 160 of America's best known and loved landscapes. Only three Presidents have not.

Many national monuments created through the Antiquities Act have since become some of our greatest national parks, like Zion, Bryce Canyon, Death Valley, Joshua Tree, and Glacier Bay to name a few. All of these parks were first national monuments that Congress decided warranted national park status.

The Antiquities Act has also been used on a bipartisan basis to preserve Federal marine areas as marine national monuments, with both President George W. Bush and President Obama using the Antiquities Act to protect some of the most unique and vulnerable areas of the Pacific Ocean.

To be clear, the Antiquities Act may only be used on existing Federal lands and waters, areas which belong to all Americans and are typically designated only after an extensive locally driven stakeholder outreach process. Instead of honoring this long bipartisan history of the Antiquities Act that has saved so much for our country, this amendment would foreclose any opportunity for local communities to seek to protect their regions' most valued marine resources located in Federal waters.

We have a generational responsibility to ensure that historic and cultural resources and important conservation areas found on our Nation's public lands and waters are available to future generations. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to help protect our Nation's most

treasured public resources through the Antiquities Act.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), also a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KILMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Antiquities Act has protected some of our most extraordinary landscapes. In my neck of the woods, it was central to the creation of Olympic National Park. It is a big deal for our oceans, too. President George W. Bush and President Obama both used the act to create marine national monuments and to help vulnerable ecosystems in our waters.

Like our forests, the ocean is an essential resource that matters to livelihoods and to the health of our planet, and we need to be sure they are around for future generations, including my daughters. But this amendment would deny any President, regardless of party, the ability to use the Antiquities Act to create marine national monuments.

The Zeldin amendment would put more than 4.5 million square miles out of reach of protection and would curb our Nation's ability to show the world that we care about our waters. We have seen the benefits of protecting sensitive areas that are at risk. It helps drive tourism while protecting fish populations that are essential to fisheries and coastal communities.

The Nation's leading aquariums support protection of unique and vulnerable ocean areas, as do hundreds of thousands of people, hundreds of scientists, educators, businessowners, boaters, surfers, beachgoers, and members of faith-based organizations, together with conservation organizations representing millions of people.

The Antiquities Act was created 110 years ago. Rather than engaging in an attack on this law, I urge my colleagues to join me and the American people in celebrating our shared history and its 110th anniversary. Vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, if the President was to designate the Plum Island Lighthouse tonight under the Antiquities Act, I would certainly welcome that, as in all the past precedent of important use and historical use of the Antiquities Act for good reason.

I introduced this amendment on behalf of all those commercial fishermen, those hardworking commercial fishermen all along the northwest Atlantic concerned that, if this marine monument is enacted by this President, they will be put out of business.

I look forward to working with all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, especially from this region, who are concerned both with the important desire for conservation, the important work of protecting and utilizing the Antiquities Act productively, but also ensuring that we are not putting our commercial fishermen out of business.

Mr. Chairman, again, I thank Chairman CALVERT and Chairman BISHOP. I would ask all of my colleagues to please support this important amendment, which is very important for my region, not just Long Island, but the entire northwest Atlantic.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I certainly appreciate my colleague from New York suggesting that he is very much in favor of the balance between conservation and supporting our commercial fishermen. Being from the State of Maine, we certainly look at both of those things. I will look forward to working with him, but I do think this amendment is an attack on our national monument Antiquities Act policies, and it should be recognized as that.

I do understand his concern about the inclusion of groups and the importance of a public input process. In New England, we take that very seriously. I agree with him that there is a vital need in the monument designation process for local voices to be heard, but the way to ensure that that occurs is not by an amendment that would stop monument designations in their tracks, and it is certainly not by stopping monument designation powers in the entire exclusive economic zone, the EEZ area.

Today we should be talking about the importance of public input in the monument process, about the importance of an open and transparent process that uses common sense. Instead, we are debating an amendment that sends the wrong message about this important conservation tool for our oceans.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this attempt to stop local coordination, collaboration, and information sharing. I do hope that the gentleman from New York and I and the other people who represent coastal communities can find a way to balance conservation and our fishing industries and work together on that.

For now, I oppose the Zeldin amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 95 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT OR ENFORCE SPECIFIC SECTIONS

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 114, 119, or 445.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes three riders that undercut sound implementation of the Endangered Species Act as it pertains to the gray wolf, the greater sage-grouse, and the lesser prairie chicken.

Despite what many of my colleagues assert, the gray wolves are not recovered. Attempts by the Fish and Wildlife Service to remove Endangered Species Act protections for wolves have failed time and again, and they have failed because the Endangered Species Act requires listing and delisting decisions be based on sound science.

The scientific experts have shown, and courts have confirmed, that the best available science does not justify the removal of all ESA protections for gray wolves at this time. This is true whether you are talking about proposals to delist wolves in the western Great Lakes, Wyoming, or nationwide.

In fact, the only instances in which wolves have been delisted is through unprecedented and unfortunate congressional action in 2011 to remove protections from wolves in the northern Rocky Mountains. These wolves are now continually persecuted by hunters and ranchers despite the positive impacts they have had on the ecosystem and the minimal toll they take on livestock.

Gray wolves are incredible animals. Their reintroduction to the Western United States has revitalized Yellowstone, and wolf-related tourism around Yellowstone generates more than \$35 million annually for local economies. And, yet, gray wolves occupy only 5 percent of their historic range.

With respect to the lesser prairie chicken, the Fish and Wildlife Service has gone to great lengths to accommodate development interests and, at the same time, protect the bird. Populations of the bird are declining rapidly, and 80 percent of the short grass prairie it calls home has been plowed, paved, or otherwise destroyed.

The Obama administration is undertaking an unprecedented effort to conserve the bird and its habitat, and, thereby, avoid the need for Endangered Species Act protections.

Federal agencies have worked closely with the States throughout the process of developing science-based strategies to conserve sage-grouse and their habitat. Claims that the States have been frozen out of the process just don't reflect realities. In fact, the 10 resource management plans released by the In-

terior Department are all based on plans developed by the States, not one-size-fits-all plans, but individual plans to suit each State. Because of these plans, the Fish and Wildlife Service determined that listing the greater sage-grouse under the Endangered Species Act was not warranted.

The ESA has been the catalyst for the conservation of many species and landscapes across the country. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I don't know quite how many clichés to use here, but where a scalpel could have been helpful, this is a meat ax that not only has missed the fingers, it has cut off the entire hand.

In 2012, the Fish and Wildlife Service did declare the gray wolf was recovered, and the Endangered Species Act demands that that goes back to State for enforcement. A court vacated that not on the basis of the science, but on a technicality. So the Fish and Wildlife Service, what it wishes to do is done in the bill. This amendment would force them to do what they don't want to do. Fish and Wildlife Service doesn't get it right that often. For heaven's sake, let them do what they want to do this time.

In 2014, the prairie chicken was listed, but they did not look at the State requirements, so it was vacated by a district court. So, once again, the underlying bill tells them what they wish to do. In fact, the Department of Justice has said they don't have any intent of appealing that decision. This allows them to do what they do. The amendment would require the Department of Justice to do what they don't want to do.

The sage-grouse last year was not listed even though it was then put in plans that would act as if it were listed, but the issue is when it was first started, Secretary Salazar told the States to actually come up with plans. Every State that has a sage-grouse population has a plan. The basic bill allows those State plans to go into effect. This amendment would prohibit the State plans from going into effect. So, in essence, this amendment tells the Fish and Wildlife Service to do what it doesn't want to do, the Justice Department to do what it doesn't want to do, and the States can't do what they do want to do.

In essence, we are doing the thing backwards, and we are harming people in the process. This is an amendment that simply sounds good on paper, but it misses the mark, and it hurts people.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), my colleague and co-sponsor of this amendment.

□ 2100

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, of course, I have tremendous respect for the chairman of the committee, but it wasn't quite an accurate statement.

Courts have found that what Fish and Wildlife said is: If you want to have delisting and manage the wolf, you must adopt an acceptable management plan. Courts have found that neither Wyoming nor Minnesota have adopted adequate management plans. In fact, we have seen basically management to the point of extirpation. Even in States that have theoretically adopted plans, like Idaho, they are attempting to reduce the population to unsustainable levels.

There is a fabulous "Dear Colleague" from Mr. RIBBLE showing the biggest, fiercest, ugliest looking wolf I have ever seen attacking a small school child. Of course, there have been no wolf attacks in the lower 48 in the recorded history of the United States, but that is what we are protecting against here tonight.

They talk about predation on cattle. If we had better management of cattle, better husbandry—it is, basically, disease and weather are the biggest cause of loss of cattle. Then the number two cause is other predators. That would be coyotes. And guess what? Wolves kill coyotes. And wolves' preferred prey is not cattle.

So what is this insane obsession with killing wolves? I don't get it. I mean, were you frightened by a wolf as a small child. I don't get it. This is an incredible, iconic top species which actually helps regulate the ecosystem. Look at Yellowstone since we had wolves reintroduced there and how much more healthy it is.

I just don't get this irrational behavior. I would urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment and don't substitute political science and stupidity for science.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE).

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would try to bring some clarity about the amendment, and I stand in opposition to this amendment.

We have heard a lot of hyperbole here this evening, but I want to try to set the record straight.

We cannot have it both ways. We can either have an Endangered Species Act and we can have the Fish and Wildlife Service and their scientists manage it, or we can get rid of it and just have the court do it.

So it appears that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, when things don't go the way they like by the Fish

and Wildlife Service, they are fully supportive of the court system. When things don't go right in the court system, it appears, Mr. Chairman, that they are fully supportive of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

What I would prefer is that we protect the Endangered Species Act and the agency that was directed to manage it and to manage these rare populations or endangered species like the gray wolf.

In the 1990s—and I am from Wisconsin—there were only a handful of mating pairs of gray wolves in northern Wisconsin. Throughout the Great Lakes region today, there are 3,700 wolves in this area. It is an economically and ecologically unsustainable number.

The Fish and Wildlife Service rightly decided that the population had recovered and that their program to protect this species had been so completely successful that it was time to delist and turn the power back to the States to manage, which in fact they were doing, until a court decided that the Fish and Wildlife Service and the experts there protecting the Endangered Species Act just didn't get it right.

Well, we cannot have it both ways, Mr. Chair, and it is time that this Congress tells the courts what the laws are and how we want these things managed. What we are doing here in this bill and in the underlying language is protecting both the Endangered Species Act and the Fish and Wildlife Service scientists who are giving the proper jurisdiction to manage endangered species, including the gray wolf.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I am very happy to support this amendment, and I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding time and for his commitment to this issue and the preservation of the Endangered Species Act.

There are many of us in Congress concerned about the continual assault that is being waged against the ESA. On an appropriations bill, and particularly the one before us today, we see attempts to reduce the scope of the Endangered Species Act and to continue to weaken its protections.

We must continue to work with the Fish and Wildlife Service to make sure they are hearing from all stakeholders and taking their concerns seriously. But that does not mean we get rid of the ESA.

We have so many strong examples of how the Endangered Species Act works and worked over the past 40 years. One of my favorites that my colleagues often hear me speak of is the success of the bald eagle and the fact that it now thrives in Maine, where it was once endangered. Where they were only once 30 nesting pairs in Maine, now there are over 630 nesting pairs of bald eagles in Maine.

There are so many other success stories, from the peregrine falcon to

the brown pelican to the sea otter. All of these success stories were based on sound science and local input through the Fish and Wildlife Service.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. You are darn right there are success stories with the ESA. That is because the agency that was designed to implement the laws decided the species were recovered. They delisted them, and they are doing fine. That is why there are so many eagles in this country.

That is not what happened with the gray wolf. The scientists at the agency decided that they had recovered. They delisted them, by rule. The courts got involved in D.C.—not in the State where the wolves are, but in D.C.—and said, "No, we disagree with all the sound science," the sound science of the agency, and they took it over. That is why we are here.

Congress makes the laws. The executive branch implements the laws. The courts interpret the laws. The agency implemented the law. Using sound science, they found that those wolves should be delisted. And they delisted them by rule. And then D.C. environmental groups went to a D.C. court and said: We don't like the decision. And now, all of a sudden, they are back.

Mr. Chairman, this is the way to respond, by law.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 96 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of—

- (1) Executive Order 13653; or
- (2) Executive Order 13693.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I firmly believe that addressing the causes and consequences of climate change is perhaps the most pressing issue of our time.

Each week, I share the latest scientific facts with my constituents about climate change—its impact on coral reefs, on disease migration, community displacement, species extinction, sea level rise, cloud movement, and so much more.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, there is no shortage of material to draw upon. Our best scientists are warning us that, unless carbon emissions were dramatically cut, we face severe consequences ecologically and economically, not to mention global instability.

We need to be doing more in this body to address the causes and consequences of climate change. Instead, we have an appropriations bill laden with riders aimed at undermining climate action.

We have section 122, which prevents the Bureau of Land Management from cutting emissions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas; section 417, prohibiting regulation of carbon dioxide methane as part of Clean Air Act title V permits; section 418, prohibiting establishment of a greenhouse reporting program for manure management; section 436, stripping the executive of its ability to incorporate the social cost of carbon into rulemakings and guidance; and, section 439, prohibiting regulation of oil and gas sector methane emissions under section 111 of the Clean Air Act.

Another provision of the bill requires the EPA to make the false assumption that burning biomass is carbon neutral. In reality, in 2012, EPA's scientific advisory board directly challenged the claim that all forest biomass is carbon neutral, explaining that while some type may indeed be carbon neutral, it is not appropriate to assume that all types of forest biomass are carbon neutral.

Numerous studies have underscored that using some types, particularly slow-growing trees, can actually increase atmospheric carbon for many decades. To know what types of biomass are truly low carbon, scientists need to assess them, and EPA deserves to have its scientific judgment uncorrupted by Congress.

With this amendment, I seek to render inert the anticlimatic action riders of this bill. Executive Order 13653, titled "Preparing the United States for the Impacts of Climate Change," requires Federal agencies to integrate considerations of the challenges posed by climate change effects into their programs, policies, rules, and operations to ensure that they continue to be effective, even as the climate changes.

Executive Order 13693, titled "Planning for Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade," requires Federal agen-

cies to carry out a range of actions to improve Federal sustainability. These include tracking and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, climate resiliency measures, energy conservation and renewable energy targets, green building goals, and other positive steps. Federal agency actions have major impacts on our contributions to global warming.

For that reason, I offer an amendment to ensure that no funds are spent on activities that are not in compliance with the President's 2013 executive order on climate change adaptation and the 2015 executive order on sustainability.

It is the right thing to do to run an effective and efficient government. It is the right to do to return the highest value to the American taxpayer.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, the gentleman wants to ensure that funds are being expended on climate and sustainability executive orders issued by the President.

Simply put, the President did not consult Congress on these executive orders. We would not be doing our job if we allowed this President or any President to unilaterally make policy decisions without allowing Congress to weigh in with appropriate policy debates.

In the meantime, we must use our congressional power of the purse to rein in executive branch overreach, which is exactly what we are going to do.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I urge everyone to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to authorize, permit, or conduct geological or geophysical activities (as those terms are used in the final programmatic environmental impact statement of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management entitled "Atlantic OCS Proposed Geological and Geophysical Activities, Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Planning Areas" and completed February 2014) in support of oil, gas, or methane hydrate exploration and development in any area located in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, or Straits of Florida Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, my bipartisan amendment would essentially prohibit geological or geophysical activities in support of oil and gas exploration and development in the Atlantic in fiscal year 2017. Most importantly, this includes seismic airgun blasting.

In March of this year, the Department of the Interior removed the Atlantic Ocean from offshore oil and gas drilling until 2022. However, the administration is still considering permits to conduct seismic airgun blasting for subsea oil and gas deposits. Not only is this unnecessary, because drilling is not permitted, but this exploratory process would cause undue harm to marine resources.

Seismic airgun pulses are loud, repetitive, explosive sounds. The produced sound can travel over enormous distances, due to its low pressure and high amplitude. Because sound travels so efficiently underwater, the noise from a blast can be heard up to 2,500 miles from the source, roughly the distance from Washington, D.C., to Las Vegas.

What these loud, repetitive, explosive sounds ultimately do is harm a range of aquatic species and the communities that rely upon them.

Numerous studies have shown that noise from seismic airgun testing negatively impacts fish. Examples include 40 to 80 percent reduced catches in the Atlantic of cod, haddock, rockfish, herring, sand eel, and blue whiting. Sea turtles and invertebrates have also been found to demonstrate alarm and avoidance responses when exposed to seismic blasts.

The critically endangered North Atlantic right whale species, of which less than 500 remain, use sound to find food, locate mates, and keep track of their young. The area proposed for blasting includes the only known right whale calving grounds in the world. Seismic airgun blasting could displace right whales from their habitats and tip the species toward extinction.

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

□ 2115

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the administration, as already mentioned, already removed the Atlantic leases from consideration in the 5-year lease plan from 2017 to 2022. This language is completely unnecessary, and I urge all the Members to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan amendment to prohibit seismic testing in the Atlantic, which I have cosponsored, along with colleagues from New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina.

After taking into account the overwhelming opposition to offshore drilling in the Atlantic, including my home State of North Carolina, the Obama administration wisely removed the prospect of drilling from the 5-year Oil and Gas Leasing Program for the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf.

Now that there are no foreseeable plans to drill among the dynamic ecosystems and pristine beaches of the Atlantic Coast, we should move immediately to prevent seismic testing and other geological and geophysical activities. Not only are these activities unnecessary in light of the administration's decision, they also pose a significant environmental threat.

Seismic testing is hugely disruptive to marine ecosystems. Its negative impacts include displacing fish over a large geographic area, reducing catch rates for commercial fishermen, and impacting the reproduction, foraging, communication, and other vital behaviors of marine mammals, including the North Atlantic right whale, one of the most endangered species on the planet.

Further, the data generated from the seismic testing is proprietary and, therefore, unavailable to the public or to policymakers who might rely on it to inform public policy, planning, or debate regarding the economic and environmental impact of offshore energy exploration.

Instead of allowing oil and gas companies to conduct an unnecessary and ecologically damaging activity, just miles from our Nation's coastline, we should be investing our time and money in advancing energy efficiency, renewable fuels, alternative energy technologies, including offshore wind development to reduce dependence on fossil fuels.

I thank my colleague from Virginia for taking the leadership on this amendment. I urge its adoption.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. How much time is left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk just for 1 minute about the community impacts. Along the Atlantic Coast nearly 1.4 million jobs and over \$95 billion in gross domestic product rely on healthy ocean ecosystems. In my State of Virginia that is 91,000 jobs and nearly \$5 billion in GDP.

The Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils have formally updated their policy position to express opposition and serious reservation to seismic airgun blasting.

Our chair kindly says this isn't necessary because the Obama administration has taken the drilling off the table until 2022, but it has not taken seismic airgun off the table, and that research will go on.

I urge my colleagues to support our amendment to put a moratorium on airgun blasting. Oil and gas development should not come at the expense of coastal communities and the marine species on which they rely.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, seismic testing has been done all over the globe for decades, not a single verifiable instance of a marine mammal being hurt or killed due to seismic activity.

In fact, I am on the Natural Resources Committee. We got Abigail Hopper's own testimony in the committee saying that there hadn't been a verifiable instance.

Go to BOEM's Web site. Their Chief Biologist has a written statement there. Not a single verifiable instance of a marine mammal being hurt or killed due to seismic.

If we want to find out what resources are available in this country for future energy independence, let's allow the seismic to happen off the coast of South Carolina, off the coast of Georgia, off the coast of North Carolina, to see if there are resources that may be harvestable to help with American energy independence going forward.

Stopping seismic is just ludicrous because there is not a single verifiable instance. Go do the research yourself on the BOEM Web site. Look at the Chief Biologist, listen to Abigail Hopper, the Director's own testimony in Natural Resources, and you will hear it for yourself.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to this amendment. I urge everyone to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-683 on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 76 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 78 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 79 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 80 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 84 by Mr. RATCLIFFE of Texas.

Amendment No. 85 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 88 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 90 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 92 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 94 by Mr. ZELDIN of New York.

Amendment No. 95 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 96 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 97 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 223, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

AYES—195

Abraham	Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Denham
Allen	Buck	DeSantis
Amash	Burgess	DesJarlais
Amodei	Byrne	Duffy
Babin	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Barletta	Carter (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Barr	Chabot	Ellmers (NC)
Barton	Chaffetz	Emmer (MN)
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Farenthold
Bilirakis	Coffman	Fincher
Bishop (MI)	Collins (GA)	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Collins (NY)	Fleming
Black	Comstock	Flores
Blackburn	Conaway	Forbes
Blum	Cook	Fortenberry
Bost	Cramer	Foxx
Boustany	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Garrett
Brat	Davidson	Gibbs

Gibson	Lucas	Rothfus	Nolan	Roybal-Allard	Torres	Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Price, Tom
Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Rouzer	Norcross	Ruiz	Tsongas	Byrne	Hultgren	Ratcliffe
Goodlatte	Lummis	Royce	O'Rourke	Rush	Turner	Calvert	Hunter	Reed
Gosar	Marchant	Russell	Pallone	Ryan (OH)	Upton	Carter (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Renacci
Gowdy	Masse	Sallon	Pascarell	Sánchez, Linda	Valadao	Carter (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Ribble
Graves (GA)	McCarthy	Sanford	Paulsen	T.	Van Hollen	Chabot	Issa	Rice (SC)
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Scalise	Payne	Sanchez, Loretta	Vargas	Chaffetz	Jenkins (KS)	Rigell
Griffith	McClintock	Schweikert	Pelosi	Sarbanes	Veasey	Clawson (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	Roby
Grothman	McHenry	Scott, Austin	Perlmutter	Schakowsky	Vela	Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Guinta	McKinley	Sensenbrenner	Peters	Schiff	Velázquez	Cole	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Guthrie	McMorris	Sessions	Peterson	Schrader	Visclosky	Collins (GA)	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Hardy	Rodgers	Shimkus	Pingree	Scott (VA)	Walden	Collins (NY)	Jones	Rohrabacher
Harper	McSally	Shuster	Pocan	Scott, David	Walters, Mimi	Comstock	Jordan	Rokita
Harris	Meadows	Smith (MO)	Poliquin	Serrano	Walz	Conaway	Joyce	Rooney (FL)
Hartzler	Mica	Smith (NE)	Polis	Sherman	Wasserman	Cook	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Posey	Simpson	Schultz	Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar	Stefanik	Posey (NC)	Sinema	Walters, Maxine	Crawford	King (IA)	Rothfus
Holding	Mooney (WV)	Stewart	Quigley	Sires	Watson Coleman	Crenshaw	Kirkpatrick	Rouzer
Hudson	Mullin	Stivers	Rangel	Slaughter	Welch	Cuellar	Kline	Royce
Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Stutzman	Reed	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield	Culberson	Knight	Russell
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (PA)	Reichert	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)	Davidson	Labrador	Salmon
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Thornberry	Rice (NY)	Speier	Woodall	Davis, Rodney	LaHood	Sanford
Hunter	Newhouse	Tiberi	Richmond	Takano	Yarmuth	Denham	LaMalfa	Scalise
Hurd (TX)	Noem	Tipton	Rigell	Thompson (CA)	Young (IN)	DeSantis	Lamborn	Schweikert
Hurt (VA)	Nugent	Tonko	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)	Zeldin	DesJarlais	Lance	Scott, Austin
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Trott	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus		Diaz-Balart	Latta	Scott, Justin
Jenkins (WV)	Olson	Wagner				Duffy	Long	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Walberg	Costa	Himes	Poe (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Loudermilk	Sessions
Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Walker	Gallego	Issa	Ruppersberger	Duncan (TN)	Love	Shimkus
Jones	Perry	Walorski	Garamendi	Marino	Sewell (AL)	Ellmers (NC)	Lucas	Shuster
Jordan	Pittenger	Weber (TX)	Granger	Messer	Swalwell (CA)	Emmer (MN)	McCarthy	Luetkemeyer
Katko	Pitts	Webster (FL)	Hastings	Pearce	Takai	Farenthold	Lummis	Smith (MO)
Kelly (MS)	Pompeo	Wenstrup				Fincher	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Kelly (PA)	Price, Tom	Westerman				Fleischmann	Masse	Smith (TX)
King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Westmoreland				Fleming	McCarthy	Stewart
Kline	Renacci	Williams				Flores	McCaul	Stivers
Knight	Ribble	Wilson (SC)				Forbes	McClintock	Stutzman
Labrador	Rice (SC)	Wittman				Fox	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
LaHood	Roby	Womack				Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Thornberry
LaMalfa	Roe (TN)	Yoder				Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Tiberi
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Yoho				Gibbs	Garrett	Tipton
Lance	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)				Gohmert	Rodgers	Trott
Latta	Rokita	Young (IA)				Goodlatte	McSally	Turner
Long	Rooney (FL)	Zinke				Messer	Meadows	Upton
Loudermilk	Roskam					Gosar	Valadao	Valadao
Love	Ross					Mica	Walberg	Walberg
						Miller (FL)	Walden	Walker
						Miller (MI)	Walorski	Walorski
						Moolenaar	Walters, Mimi	Walters, Mimi
						Mooney (WV)	Weber (TX)	Weber (TX)
						Murphy (PA)	Webster (FL)	Webster (FL)
						Neugebauer	Wenstrup	Wenstrup
						Newhouse	Westerman	Westerman
						Noem	Westmoreland	Westmoreland
						Nugent	Williams	Williams
						Nunes	Wilson (SC)	Wilson (SC)
						Olson	Wittman	Wittman
						Palazzo	Womack	Womack
						Palmer	Woodall	Woodall
						Hensarling	Perry	Perry
						Herrera Beutler	Peterson	Peterson
						Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger	Pittenger
						Hill	Hill	Hill
						Holding	Poliquin	Poliquin
						Hudson	Pompeo	Pompeo
						Huelskamp	Posey	Posey

NOT VOTING—15

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2141

Messrs. HINOJOSA, KINZINGER of Illinois, and GRAYSON changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. FINCHER and McHENRY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chair, during rollcall Vote No. 453 on H.R. 5538, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yes” when I should have voted “no.”

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted: “No” on rollcall No. 453.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 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 ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 203, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

AYES—219

Adams	DeFazio	Jolly	Abraham	Barr	Boustany
Aguilar	DeGette	Joyce	Aderholt	Barton	Brady (TX)
Ashford	Delaney	Kaptur	Allen	Benishek	Brat
Bass	DeLauro	Keating	Amash	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Beatty	DelBene	Kelly (IL)	Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)
Becerra	Dent	Kennedy	Ashford	Black	Brooks (IN)
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kildee	Babin	Blum	Buck
Beyer	Deutch	Kilmer	Barletta	Bost	Bucshon
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Kind			
Blumenauer	Dingell	King (NY)			
Bonamici	Doggett	Kinzinger (IL)			
Boyle, Brendan F.	Dold	Kirkpatrick			
Brady (PA)	Donovan	Kuster			
Brooks (IN)	Doyle, Michael F.	Langevin			
Brown (FL)	Duckworth	Larsen (WA)			
Brownley (CA)	Edwards	Larson (CT)			
Buchanan	Ellison	Lawrence			
Bucshon	Engel	Lee			
Bustos	Eshoo	Levin			
Butterfield	Esty	Lewis			
Calvert	Farr	Lieu, Ted			
Capps	Fitzpatrick	Lipinski			
Capuano	Foster	LoBiondo			
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Loeb sack			
Carney	Frelinghuysen	Lowenthal			
Carson (IN)	Fudge	Lowe			
Cartwright	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham			
Castor (FL)	Graham	(NM)			
Castro (TX)	Graves (LA)	Luján, Ben Ray			
Chu, Judy	Grayson	(NM)			
Ciциlline	Green, Al	Lynch			
Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	MacArthur			
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Maloney			
Cleaver	Gutiérrez	Carolyn			
Clyburn	Hahn	Maloney, Sean			
Cohen	Hanna	Matsui			
Cole	Heck (NV)	McColum			
Connolly	Heck (WA)	McDermott			
Conyers	Herrera Beutler	McGovern			
Cooper	Higgins	McNerney			
Costello (PA)	Hill	Meehan			
Courtney	Hinojosa	Meeks			
Crenshaw	Honda	Meng			
Crowley	Hoyer	Miller (MI)			
Cuellar	Huffman	Moore			
Cummings	Israel	Moulton			
Curbelo (FL)	Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)			
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Nadler			
Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano			
	Johnson, E. B.	Neal			

NOES—203

Adams	Clay	Ellison
Aguilar	Cleaver	Engel
Bass	Clyburn	Eshoo
Beatty	Cohen	Esty
Becerra	Connolly	Farr
Bera	Conyers	Fitzpatrick
Beyer	Cooper	Fortenberry
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Foster
Bishop (MI)	Costello (PA)	Frankel (FL)
Blumenauer	Courtney	Fudge
Bonamici	Crowley	Gabbard
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cummings	Galleo
Brady (PA)	Curbelo (FL)	Garamendi
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Gibson
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Graham
Buchanan	DeFazio	Grayson
Bustos	DeGette	Green, Al
Butterfield	Delaney	Green, Gene
Capps	DeLauro	Grijalva
Capuano	DelBene	Gutiérrez
Cárdenas	Dent	Hahn
Carney	DeSaulnier	Hanna
Carson (IN)	Deutch	Heck (WA)
Cartwright	Dingell	Higgins
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Hinojosa
Castro (TX)	Dold	Honda
Chu, Judy	Donovan	Hoyer
Ciциlline	Doyle, Michael F.	Huffman
Clark (MA)	Duckworth	Israel
Clarke (NY)	Edwards	Jackson Lee

Johnson (GA) McGovern
 Johnson, E. B. McNerney
 Kaptur Meehan
 Katko Meeks
 Keating Meng
 Kelly (IL) Moore
 Kennedy Moulton
 Kildee Murphy (FL)
 Kilmer Nadler
 Kind Napolitano
 King (NY) Neal
 Kinzinger (IL) Nolan
 Kuster Norcross
 Langevin O'Rourke
 Larsen (WA) Pallone
 Larson (CT) Pascrell
 Lawrence Paulsen
 Lee Payne
 Levin Pelosi
 Lewis Perlmutter
 Lieu, Ted Peters
 Lipinski Pingree
 LoBiondo Pocan
 Loebsock Polis
 Lofgren Price (NC)
 Lowenthal Quigley
 Lowey Rangel
 Lujan Grisham Reichert
 (NM) Rice (NY)
 Luján, Ben Ray Richmond
 (NM) Ros-Lehtinen
 Lynch Roybal-Allard
 MacArthur Ruiz
 Maloney, Carolyn Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Maloney, Sean Sánchez, Linda
 Matsui T.
 McCollum Sanchez, Loretta
 McDermott Sarbanes

NOT VOTING—11

Blackburn Mullin Sewell (AL)
 Hastings Pearce Swallow (CA)
 Himes Poe (TX) Takai
 Marino Ruppertsberger

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2144

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.
 PERRY) 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 will be a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 161, noes 262,
 not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 455]

AYES—161

Abraham Bost Clawson (FL)
 Aderholt Boustany Coffman
 Allen Brat Collins (GA)
 Amash Bridenstine Collins (NY)
 Babin Brooks (AL) Conaway
 Barletta Brooks (IN) Cook
 Barr Buchanan Cramer
 Benishek Buck Crawford
 Bilirakis Burgess Culberson
 Bishop (UT) Byrne Davidson
 Black Carter (GA) DeSantis
 Blackburn Carter (TX) DesJarlais
 Blum Chabot Duffy

Duncan (SC) Johnson, Sam
 Duncan (TN) Jones
 Ellmers (NC) Jordan
 Farenthold Kelly (MS)
 Fincher Kelly (PA)
 Fleischmann Labrador
 Fleming LaHood
 Flores LaMalfa
 Forbes Lamborn
 Foyx Latta
 Franks (AZ) Long
 Garrett Loudermilk
 Gibbs Luetkemeyer
 Gibson Lummis
 Gohmert Marchant
 Goodlatte Massie
 Gosar McHenry
 Gowdy McKinley
 Granger McMorris
 Graves (GA) Rodgers
 Graves (MO) Meadows
 Griffith Messer
 Grothman Miller (FL)
 Guinta Miller (MI)
 Guthrie Mooleenaar
 Harper Mooney (WV)
 Harris Mullin
 Hartzler Mulvaney
 Hensarling Murphy (PA)
 Hice, Jody B. Neugebauer
 Holding Newhouse
 Hudson Noem
 Huelskamp Olson
 Huizenga (MI) Palmer
 Hultgren Perry
 Hurd (TX) Pittenger
 Hurt (VA) Pompeo
 Issa Posey
 Jenkins (KS) Ratcliffe
 Jenkins (WV) Reed
 Johnson (OH) Renacci

NOES—262

Adams DeFazio Jeffries
 Aguilar DeGette Johnson (GA)
 Amodei Delaney Johnson, E. B.
 Ashford DeLauro Jolly
 Barton DelBene Joyce
 Bass Denham Kaptur
 Beatty Dent Katko
 Becerra DeSaulnier Keating
 Bera Deutch Kelly (IL)
 Beyer Diaz-Balart Kennedy
 Bishop (GA) Dingell Kildee
 Bishop (MI) Doggett Kilmer
 Blumenauer Dold Kind
 Bonamici Donovan King (IA)
 Boyle, Brendan Doyle, Michael King (NY)
 F. Kirkpatrick
 Brady (PA) Duckworth Kline
 Brown (FL) Edwards Knight
 Brownley (CA) Ellison Kuster
 Bucshon Emmer (MN) Lance
 Bustos Engel Langevin
 Butterfield Eshoo Larsen (WA)
 Calvert Esty Larson (CT)
 Capps Farr Lawrence
 Capuano Fitzpatrick Lee
 Cárdenas Fortenberry Levin
 Carney Foster Lewis
 Carson (IN) Frankel (FL) Lieu, Ted
 Cartwright Cartwright Frelinghuysen Lipinski
 Castor (FL) Fudge LoBiondo
 Castro (TX) Gabbard Loebsock
 Chaffetz Gallego Lofgren
 Chu, Judy Garamendi Love
 Cicilline Graham Lowenthal
 Clark (MA) Clark (LA) Lowey
 Clarke (NY) Grayson Lucas
 Clay Green, Al Lujan Grisham
 Cleaver Green, Gene (NM)
 Clyburn Grijalva Luján, Ben Ray
 Cohen Gutierrez (NM)
 Cole Hahn Lynch
 Comstock Hanna MacArthur
 Connolly Hardy Maloney,
 Conyers Heck (NV) Carolyn
 Cooper Heck (WA) Maloney, Sean
 Costa Herrera Beutler Matsui
 Costello (PA) Higgins McCarthy
 Courtney Hill McCaul
 Crownshaw Himes McClintock
 Crowley Hinojosa McCollum
 Cuellar Honda McDermott
 Cummings Hoyer McGovern
 Curbelo (FL) Huffman McNerney
 Hunter Hunter Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny Israel
 Davis, Rodney Jackson Lee

Ribble Meng
 Rice (SC) Mica Rigell
 Roby Moore Rogers (KY)
 Roe (TN) Moulton Rohrbacher
 Rogers (AL) Murphy (FL) Ros-Lehtinen
 Rokita Nadler Roskam
 Rooney (FL) Napolitano Roybal-Allard
 Ross Neal Royce
 Rothfus Nolan Ruiz
 Rouzer Norcross Trotter
 Salmon Nugent Russell
 Sanford Nunes Ryan (OH)
 Scalise O'Rourke Sanchez, Linda
 Schweikert Palazon T.
 Scott, Austin Sarbanes Sanchez, Loretta
 Sessions Pascrell Sarbanes
 Shimkus Paulsen Schakowsky
 Shuster Payne Schiff
 Smith (MO) Pelosi Schrader
 Smith (NE) Perlmutter Scott (VA)
 Smith (TX) Peters Scott, David
 Stutzman Peterson Sensenbrenner
 Thornberry Pingree Serrano
 Tipton Pitts Sherman
 Wagner Pocan Simpson
 Walberg Walberg Sinema
 Walden Walker Poliquin
 Walker Walorski Sires
 Weber (TX) Price (NC) Slaughter
 Westerman Price, Tom Smith (NJ)
 Williams Quigley Smith (WA)
 Wilson (SC) Rice (NY) Speier
 Wittman Stivers Stefanik
 Womack Swallow (CA) Stewart
 Woodall Swallow (CA) Stivers
 Yoder Brady (TX) Pearce
 Yoho Hastings Poe (TX)
 Young (IA) Kinzinger (IL) Ruppertsberger
 Young (IN) Marino Sewell (AL)
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Brady (TX) Pearce Takai
 Hastings Poe (TX) Tiberi
 Kinzinger (IL) Ruppertsberger
 Marino Sewell (AL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2147

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.
 PERRY) 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 188, noes 239,
 not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

AYES—188

Abraham Brat Crawford
 Aderholt Bridenstine Culberson
 Allen Brooks (AL) Davidson
 Amash Brooks (IN) Denham
 Babin Buck DeSantis
 Barletta Burgess DesJarlais
 Barr Byrnes Duffy
 Barton Carter (GA) Duncan (SC)
 Benishek Carter (TX) Duncan (TN)
 Bilirakis Chabot Ellmers (NC)
 Bishop (MI) Chaffetz Emmer (MN)
 Bishop (UT) Clawson (FL) Farenthold
 Black Collins (GA) Fincher
 Blackburn Collins (NY) Fleischmann
 Blum Conaway Fleming
 Bost Conyers Flores
 Boustany Cook Forbes
 Brady (TX) Cramer Foxx

Franks (AZ) Loudermilk
Garrett Love
Gibbs Luetkemeyer
Gohmert Lummis
Goodlatte Marchant
Gosar Massie
Gowdy McCarthy
Granger McCaul
Graves (GA) McClintock
Graves (LA) McHenry
Graves (MO) McKinley
Griffith McMorris
Grothman Rodgers
Guinta Meadows
Guthrie Messer
Harper Miller (FL)
Harris Miller (MI)
Hartzler Moolenaar
Hensarling Mooney (WV)
Hice, Jody B. Mullin
Hill Mulvaney
Holding Murphy (PA)
Hudson Neugebauer
Huelskamp Newhouse
Huizenga (MI) Noem
Hultgren Olson
Hunter Palazzo
Hurd (TX) Palmer
Hurt (VA) Perry
Issa Peterson
Jenkins (KS) Pittenger
Jenkins (WV) Pitts
Johnson (OH) Pompeo
Johnson, Sam Posey
Jones Price, Tom
Jordan Ratcliffe
Kelly (MS) Ribble
Kelly (PA) Rice (SC)
King (IA) Rigell
Knight Roby
Labrador Roe (TN)
LaMalfa Rogers (AL)
Lamborn Rogers (KY)
Latta Rohrabacher
Long Rokita

NOES—239

Adams Davis, Rodney
Aguilar DeFazio
Amodei DeGette
Ashford Delaney
Bass DeLauro
Beatty DelBene
Becerra Dent
Bera DeSaulnier
Beyer Deutch
Bishop (GA) Diaz-Balart
Blumenauer Dingell
Bonamici Doggett
Boyle, Brendan Dold
F. Donovan
Brady (PA) Doyle, Michael
Brown (FL) F.
Brownley (CA) Duckworth
Buchanan Edwards
Bucshon Ellison
Bustos Engel
Butterfield Eshoo
Calvert Esty
Capps Farr
Capuano Fitzpatrick
Cárdenas Fortenberry
Carney Foster
Carson (IN) Frankel (FL)
Cartwright Frelinghuysen
Castor (FL) Fudge
Castro (TX) Gabbard
Chu, Judy Gallego
Cicilline Garamendi
Clark (MA) Gibson
Clarke (NY) Graham
Clay Grayson
Cleaver Green, Al
Clyburn Green, Gene
Coffman Grijalva
Cohen Gutiérrez
Cole Hahn
Comstock Hanna
Connolly Hardy
Cooper Heck (NV)
Costa Heck (WA)
Costello (PA) Herrera Beutler
Courtney Higgins
Crowley Himes
Cuellar Hinojosa
Cummings Honda
Curbelo (FL) Hoyer
Davis (CA) Huffman
Davis, Danny Israel

Rooney (FL) Meeks
Ross Meng
Rothfus Mica
Rouzer Moore
Royce Moulton
Russell Murphy (FL)
Salmon Nadler
Sanford Napolitano
Scalise Neal
Schweikert Nolan
Scott, Austin Norcross
Sensenbrenner Nugent
Sessions Nunes
Shimkus O'Rourke
Shuster Pallone
Smith (MO) Pascrell
Smith (NE) Schiff
Smith (TX) Schrader
Stewart Scott (VA)
Stutzman Scott, David
Thompson (PA) Serrano
Thornberry Sewell (AL)
Tiberi Sherman
Tipton Simpson
Poliquin Sinema
Polis Sires
Price (NC) Slaughter
Quigley Smith (NJ)
Rangel Smith (WA)
Reed Speier
Reichert Stefanik

NOT VOTING—6

Crenshaw Marino
Hastings Pearce

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2150

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes 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 231, noes 197,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]
AYES—231

Abraham Buck
Aderholt Bucshon
Allen Burgess
Amash Byrne
Amodei Calvert
Babin Carter (GA)
Barietta Carter (TX)
Barr Chabot
Barton Chaffetz
Brenshaw Clawson (FL)
Bridenstine Coffman
Brooks (AL) Cole
Brooks (IN) Collins (GA)
Buchanan Collins (NY)
Comstock Comstock
Conaway Conaway
Cook Cook
Cramer Cramer
Crawford Crawford
Crenshaw Crenshaw
Culberson Culberson
Davidson Davidson
Davis, Rodney Davis, Rodney
Denham Denham

Gosar Swalwell (CA)
Gowdy Takano
Granger Thompson (CA)
Graves (GA) Thompson (MS)
Graves (LA) Titus
Graves (MO) Ruiz
Griffith Tonko
Grothman Torres
Guinta Tsongas
Guthrie Turner
Hardy Valadao
Harper Van Hollen
Harris Vargas
Hartzler Veasey
Heck (NV) Vela
Hensarling Velázquez
Herrera Beutler Visclosky
Hice, Jody B. Walden
Hill Walz
Holding Wasserman
Hudson Schultz
Huelskamp Waters, Maxine
Huizenga (MI) Watson Coleman
Hultgren Webster (FL)
Hunter Welch
Hurd (TX) Wilson (FL)
Hurt (VA) Yarmuth
Issa Young (IA)
Jenkins (KS) Zeldin
Jenkins (WV) Zinke
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam

Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer

NOES—197

Adams Curbelo (FL)
Aguilar Davis (GA)
Ashford Davis, Danny
Bass DeFazio
Beatty DeGette
Becerra Delaney
Bera DeLauro
Beyer DelBene
Bishop (GA) Dent
Blumenauer DeSaulnier
Bonamici Deutch
Boyle, Brendan Dingell
F. Doggett
Brady (PA) Dold
Brown (FL) Doyle, Michael
Brownley (CA) F.
Bustos Duckworth
Butterfield Edwards
Capps Ellison
Capuano Engel
Cárdenas Eshoo
Carney Esty
Carson (IN) Farr
Cartwright Fitzpatrick
Castor (FL) Foster
Castro (TX) Frankel (FL)
Chu, Judy Lipinski
Cicilline Gabbard
Clark (MA) Gallego
Clarke (NY) Garamendi
Clay Graham
Cleaver Grayson
Clyburn Green, Al
Cohen Green, Gene
Connolly Grijalva
Conyers Gutiérrez
Cooper Hahn
Costa Hanna
Costello (PA) Heck (WA)
Courtney Higgins
Crowley Himes
Cuellar Hinojosa
Cummings Honda

Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Caro lyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott

McGovern	Price (NC)	Slaughter	Labrador	Nunes	Smith (NE)	Rice (NY)	Scott, David	Torres
McNerney	Quigley	Smith (WA)	LaHood	Perry	Stewart	Richmond	Serrano	Tsongas
Meehan	Rangel	Speier	LaMalfa	Pittenger	Stivers	Roby	Sessions	Turner
Meeks	Rice (NY)	Swalwell (CA)	Lamborn	Pitts	Stutzman	Rogers (AL)	Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen
Meng	Richmond	Takano	Lance	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)	Rogers (KY)	Sherman	Vargas
Moore	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)	Latta	Pompeo	Tiberi	Rooney (FL)	Simpson	Veasey
Moulton	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)	Long	Posey	Tipton	Ros-Lehtinen	Sinema	Vela
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Titus	Loudermilk	Price, Tom	Troott	Roybal-Allard	Sires	Velázquez
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Tonko	Love	Reed	Upton	Ruiz	Slaughter	Visclosky
Napolitano	Rush	Torres	Lucas	Renacci	Valadao	Ruppersberger	Smith (NJ)	Walden
Neal	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas	Luetkemeyer	Ribble	Wagner	Rush	Smith (TX)	Walz
Nolan	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen	Lummis	Rice (SC)	Walberg	Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Wasserman
Norcross	T.	Vargas	Massie	Rigell	Walker	Sánchez, Linda	Speier	Schultz
O'Rourke	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey	McCarthy	Roe (TN)	Walorski	T.	Stefanik	Waters, Maxine
Pallone	Sarbanes	Vela	McClintock	Rohrabacher	Walters, Mimi	Sanchez, Loretta	Swalwell (CA)	Watson Coleman
Pascarell	Schakowsky	Velázquez	McHenry	Rokita	Wenstrup	Sarbanes	Takano	Weber (TX)
Payne	Schiff	Visclosky	McKinley	Roskam	Westerman	Scalise	Thompson (CA)	Webster (FL)
Pelosi	Schrader	Walz	McMorris	Ross	Westmoreland	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Wasserman	Rodgers	Rothfus	Whitfield	Schiff	Thornberry	Williams
Peters	Scott, David	Schultz	McSally	Rouzer	Wilson (SC)	Schrader	Titus	Wilson (FL)
Peterson	Serrano	Waters, Maxine	Meadows	Royce	Wittman	Scott (VA)	Tonko	Yarmuth
Pingree	Sewell (AL)	Watson Coleman	Messer	Russell	Womack			
Pocan	Sherman	Welch	Mica	Woodall				
Poliquin	Sinema	Wilson (FL)	Miller (MI)	Yoder				
Polis	Sires	Yarmuth	Moolenaar	Yoho				
			Mooney (WV)	Young (AK)				
			Mullin	Young (IA)				
			Mulvaney	Young (IN)				
			Newhouse	Zeldin				
			Noem	Zinke				

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings	Pearce	Takai
Marino	Poe (TX)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2153

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 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 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 170, noes 257, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

AYES—170

Allen	Cramer	Grothman
Amash	Crawford	Guinta
Amodei	Davidson	Guthrie
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Hardy
Barr	Denham	Harris
Benishek	DeSantis	Hartzler
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Black	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Blackburn	Ellmers (NC)	Huelskamp
Blum	Emmer (MN)	Huizenga (MI)
Bost	Fincher	Hultgren
Brat	Fleischmann	Hunter
Bridenstine	Fleming	Hurt (VA)
Brooks (IN)	Forbes	Issa
Buck	Fox	Jenkins (KS)
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Chabot	Garrett	Jolly
Chaffetz	Gibbs	Jones
Clawson (FL)	Goodlatte	Jordan
Coffman	Gosar	Joyce
Cole	Gowdy	Kelly (PA)
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	King (IA)
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Kline
Cook	Griffith	Knight

NOES—257

Abraham	Dent
Adams	DeSaulnier
Aderholt	Deutch
Aguilar	Diaz-Balart
Ashford	Dingell
Babin	Doggett
Barton	Dold
Bass	Donovan
Beatty	Doyle, Michael F.
Becerra	Duckworth
Bera	Edwards
Beyer	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Engel
Blumenauer	Bonamici
Bonamici	Eshoo
Boustany	Esty
Boyle, Brendan F.	Farenthold
Brady (PA)	Farr
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (AL)	Flores
Brown (FL)	Portenberry
Brownley (CA)	Foster
Buchanan	Frankel (FL)
Burgess	Fudge
Bustos	Gabbard
Butterfield	Gallego
Byrne	Garamendi
Calvert	Gibson
Capps	Gohmert
Capuano	Graham
Cárdenas	Granger
Carney	Graves (LA)
Carson (IN)	Grayson
Carter (TX)	Green, Al
Cartwright	Green, Gene
Castor (FL)	Grijalva
Castro (TX)	Gutiérrez
Chu, Judy	Hahn
Cicilline	Hanna
Clark (MA)	Harper
Clarke (NY)	Heck (NV)
Clay	Heck (WA)
Cleaver	Hensarling
Clyburn	Higgins
Cohen	Hill
Comstock	Himes
Conaway	Hinojosa
Connolly	Honda
Conyers	Hoyer
Cooper	Huffman
Costa	Hurd (TX)
Costello (PA)	Israel
Courtney	Jackson Lee
Crenshaw	Jeffries
Crowley	Johnson (GA)
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.
Culberson	Johnson, Sam
Cummings	Kaptur
Curbelo (FL)	Katko
Davis (CA)	Keating
Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)
DeFazio	Kelly (MS)
DeGette	Kennedy
Delaney	Kildee
DeLauro	Kilmer
DelBene	Kind
	King (NY)

NOT VOTING—6

Hastings	Murphy (PA)	Poe (TX)
Marino	Pearce	Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2157

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 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 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 226, noes 202, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

AYES—226

Abraham	Chaffetz	Forbes
Aderholt	Clawson (FL)	Fortenberry
Allen	Coffman	Fox
Amash	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Babin	Collins (NY)	Garrett
Barletta	Comstock	Gibbs
Barr	Conaway	Gohmert
Barton	Cook	Goodlatte
Benishek	Cramer	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gowdy
Bishop (MI)	Crenshaw	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Black	Davidson	Graves (LA)
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Blum	Denham	Griffith
Bost	Dent	Grothman
Boustany	DeSantis	Guinta
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Bridenstine	Donovan	Hardy
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Harper
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Bucshon	Ellmers (NC)	Heck (NV)
Burgess	Emmer (MN)	Hensarling
Byrne	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler
Calvert	Fincher	Hice, Jody B.
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Hill
Carter (TX)	Fleming	Holding
Chabot	Flores	Hudson

Huelskamp	Miller (FL)	Schweikert	Quigley	Scott (VA)	Tonko	Hurd (TX)	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Huizenga (MI)	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin	Rangel	Scott, David	Torres	Hurt (VA)	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Hultgren	Moolenaar	Sensenbrenner	Reed	Serrano	Tsongas	Issa	Moolenaar	Shimkus
Hunter	Mooney (WV)	Sessions	Rice (NY)	Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen	Jenkins (KS)	Mooney (WV)	Shuster
Hurd (TX)	Mullin	Shimkus	Richmond	Sherman	Vargas	Mullin	Jenkins (WV)	Simpson
Hurt (VA)	Mulvaney	Shuster	Ros-Lehtinen	Simpson	Veasey	Johnson (OH)	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)
Issa	Murphy (PA)	Smith (MO)	Roybal-Allard	Sinema	Vela	Johnson, Sam	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)
Jenkins (KS)	Neugebauer	Smith (NE)	Ruiz	Sires	Velázquez	Jolly	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Jenkins (WV)	Newhouse	Smith (TX)	Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Visclosky	Jones	Newhouse	Stefanik
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Stewart	Rush	Smith (NJ)	Walz	Jordan	Noem	Stewart
Johnson, Sam	Nugent	Stivers	Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Wasserman	Joyce	Nugent	Stivers
Jones	Nunes	Stutzman	Sanchez, Linda	Speier	Waters	Katko	Nunes	Stutzman
Jordan	Olson	Thompson (PA)	T.	Stefanik	Schultz	Kelly (MS)	Olson	Thompson (PA)
Joyce	Palazzo	Thornberry	Sanchez, Loretta	Swalwell (CA)	Waters, Maxine	Kelly (PA)	Palazzo	Thornberry
Katko	Palmer	Tiberi	Sarbanes	Takano	Watson Coleman	King (IA)	Palmer	Tiberi
Kelly (MS)	Perry	Tipton	Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Welch	King (NY)	Perry	Tipton
Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Trott	Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Peterson	Trott
King (IA)	Pittenger	Turner	Schrader	Titus	Yarmuth	Kline	Pittenger	Turner
King (NY)	Pitts	Upton				Knigh	Pitts	Turner
Kline	Poliquin	Upton				Labrador	Poliquin	Upton
Knight	Pompeo	Valadao				LaHood	Pompeo	Valadao
Labrador	Posey	Wagner	Hastings	Pearce	Takai	LaHood	Pompeo	Valadao
LaHood	Price, Tom	Walberg	Marino	Poe (TX)		LaMalfa	Vela	Vela
LaMalfa	Ratcliffe	Walden				Lamborn	Price, Tom	Wagner
Lamborn	Reichert	Walker				Lance	Ratcliffe	Walberg
Latta	Renacci	Walorski				Latta	Reed	Walden
Long	Ribble	Walters, Mimi				Long	Renacci	Walker
Loudermilk	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)				Loudermilk	Ribble	Walorski
Love	Rigell	Webster (FL)				Love	Rice (SC)	Walters, Mimi
Lucas	Roby	Wenstrup				Lucas	Rigell	Walters, Mimi
Luetkemeyer	Roe (TN)	Westerman				Luetkemeyer	Roby	Webster (FL)
Lummis	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland				Lummis	Roe (TN)	Westerman
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield				MacArthur	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
Massie	Rohrabacher	Williams				Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Westmoreland
McCarthy	Rokita	Wilson (SC)				Massie	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Wittman				McCarthy	Rokita	Williams
McClintock	Roskam	Womack				McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (SC)
McHenry	Ross	Woodall				McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
McKinley	Rothfus	Yoder				McHenry	Roskam	Womack
McMorris	Rouzer	Yoho				McKinley	Ross	Woodall
McMorris	Royce	Young (AK)				McMorris	Rothfus	Yoder
Rodgers	Russell	Young (IA)				Rodgers	Rouzer	Yoder
McSally	Russell	Young (IN)				McSally	Russell	Yoho
Meadows	Salmon	Zeldin				Meadows	Salmon	Young (AK)
Messer	Sanford	Zinke				Meehan	Scalise	Young (IA)
Mica	Scalise					Messer	Schweikert	Young (IN)
						Mica	Scott, Austin	Zinke

NOES—202

Adams	DeSaulnier	Lance
Aguilar	Deutch	Langevin
Ashford	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Bass	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Beatty	Dold	Lawrence
Becerra	Doyle, Michael	Lee
Bera	F.	Levin
Beyer	Duckworth	Lewis
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Lieu, Ted
Blumenauer	Ellison	Lipinski
Bonamici	Engel	LoBiondo
Boyle, Brendan	Eshoo	LoBisack
F.	Esty	Lofgren
Brady (PA)	Farr	Lowenthal
Brown (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Lowe
Brownley (CA)	Foster	Lujan Grisham
Buchanan	Frankel (FL)	(NM)
Bustos	Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray
Butterfield	Gabbard	(NM)
Capps	Gallego	Lynch
Capuano	Garamendi	MacArthur
Cárdenas	Gibson	Maloney,
Carney	Graham	Carolyn
Carson (IN)	Grayson	Maloney, Sean
Cartwright	Green, Al	Matsui
Castor (FL)	Green, Gene	McCollum
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	McDermott
Chu, Judy	Gutiérrez	McDermott
Cicilline	Hahn	McGovern
Clark (MA)	Heck (WA)	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Higgins	Meehan
Clay	Himes	Meeks
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Meng
Clyburn	Honda	Moore
Cohen	Hoyer	Moulton
Connolly	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Conyers	Israel	Nadler
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Costa	Jeffries	Neal
Costello (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Nolan
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Norcross
Crowley	Jolly	O'Rourke
Cuellar	Kaptur	Pallone
Cummings	Keating	Pascarell
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Paulsen
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Payne
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Pelosi
DeFazio	Kilmer	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kind	Peters
Delaney	Kinzinger (IL)	Pingree
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Pocan
DeBene	Kuster	Polis
		Price (NC)

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings Pearce Takai
Marino Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2200

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) on
which further proceedings were post-
poned and on which the ayes 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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 237, noes 191,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

AYES—237

Abraham	Cole	Foxx
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Allen	Collins (NY)	Frelinghuysen
Amash	Comstock	Garrett
Amodei	Conaway	Gibbs
Babin	Cook	Gohmert
Barletta	Costa	Goodlatte
Barr	Costello (PA)	Gosar
Barton	Cramer	Gowdy
Benishek	Crawford	Granger
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Graves (LA)
Bishop (MI)	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Bishop (UT)	Curbelo (FL)	Green, Gene
Black	Davidson	Griffith
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Grothman
Blum	Denham	Guinta
Bost	Dent	Guthrie
Boustany	DeSantis	Hanna
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Hardy
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Bridenstine	Donovan	Harris
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Hartzer
Buchanan	Duncan (SC)	Heck (NV)
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Hensarling
Bucshon	Ellmers (NC)	Herrera Beutler
Burgess	Emmer (MN)	Hice, Jody B.
Byrne	Farenthold	Hill
Calvert	Fincher	Holding
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Hudson
Carter (TX)	Fleming	Huelskamp
Chabot	Flores	Huizenga (MI)
Chaffetz	Forbes	Hultgren
Coffman	Fortenberry	Hunter
Adams	Doggett	Levin
Aguilar	Dold	Lewis
Ashford	Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted
Bass	F.	Lipinski
Beatty	Duckworth	LoBiondo
Becerra	Edwards	LoBisack
Bera	Ellison	Lofgren
Beyer	Engel	Lowenthal
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Lowe
Bonamici	Esty	Lujan Grisham
Boyle, Brendan	Farr	(NM)
F.	Fitzpatrick	Luján, Ben Ray
Brady (PA)	Foster	(NM)
Brooks (AL)	Frankel (FL)	Lynch
Brown (FL)	Fudge	Maloney,
Brownley (CA)	Gabbard	Carolyn
Buchanan	Gallego	Maloney, Sean
Bustos	Garamendi	Matsui
Butterfield	Gibson	McCollum
Capps	Graham	McDermott
Capuano	Grayson	McGovern
Cárdenas	Green, Al	McNerney
Carney	Grijalva	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Gutiérrez	Meng
Cartwright	Hahn	Moore
Castor (FL)	Heck (WA)	Moulton
Castro (TX)	Higgins	Murphy (FL)
Chu, Judy	Himes	Nadler
Cicilline	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Clark (MA)	Honda	Neal
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Nolan
Clay	Huffman	Norcross
Cleaver	Israel	O'Rourke
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Cohen	Jeffries	Pascarell
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Cooper	Kaptur	Pelosi
Costa	Keating	Perlmutter
Costello (PA)	Kelly (IL)	Peters
Courtney	Kennedy	Pingree
Crowley	Kildee	Pocan
Cuellar	Kilmer	Polis
Cummings	Kind	Price (NC)
Curbelo (FL)	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Rangel
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Reichert
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Richmond
Delaney	Lawrence	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Lee	Royce

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings
Marino

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2203

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) on
which further proceedings were post-
poned and on which the ayes 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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 242, noes 185,
not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

AYES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole

Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions

Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions

NOES—185

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold

Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Delaney
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)

NOT VOTING—6

Hastings
Marino

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2207

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes 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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 225, noes 202,
not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

AYES—225

LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeke
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes

Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas

Crenshaw
Culberson
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling

Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Massie

McCarthy	Reed	Stutzman	Thompson (CA)	Van Hollen	Wasserman	Pallone	Sanford	Titus
McCaul	Renacci	Thompson (PA)	Thompson (MS)	Vargas	Schultz	Pascrell	Sarbanes	Tonko
McClintock	Ribble	Thornberry	Titus	Veasey	Watson Coleman	Payne	Schakowsky	Torres
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Tiberi	Tonko	Vela	Welch	Pelosi	Schiff	Tsongas
McKinley	Rigell	Tipton	Torres	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)	Perlmutter	Schrader	Van Hollen
McMorris	Roby	Trott	Tsongas	Visclosky	Yarmuth	Peters	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Turner	Upton	Walz		Pingree	Scott, David	Veasey
McSally	Rogers (AL)	Valadao				Pocan	Serrano	Vela
Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Wagner				Polis	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Messer	Rohrabacher	Walberg	Hastings	Pearce	Takai	Price (NC)	Sherman	Visclosky
Mica	Rokita	Walden	Marino	Poe (TX)	Waters, Maxine	Quigley	Sinema	Walz
Miller (FL)	Rooney (FL)	Walker				Rangel	Sires	Wasserman
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Walorski				Rice (NY)	Slaughter	Schultz
Moolenaar	Ross	Walters, Mimi				Richmond	Smith (NJ)	Smith (WA)
Mooney (WV)	Rothfus	Webster (FL)				Roybal-Allard	Smith (NJ)	Waters, Maxine
Mullin	Rouzer	Weber (TX)				Ruiz	Speier	Watson Coleman
Mulvaney	Royce	Webster (FL)				Ruppersberger	Swalwell (CA)	Welch
Murphy (PA)	Russell	Wenstrup				Ryan (OH)	Takano	Whitfield
Neugebauer	Salmon	Westerman				Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Newhouse	Sanford	Westmoreland				T.	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Noem	Scalise	Whitfield						
Nugent	Schweikert	Williams						
Nunes	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)						
Olson	Sensenbrenner	Wittman						
Palazzo	Sessions	Womack						
Palmer	Shimkus	Woodall						
Perry	Shuster	Yoder						
Pittenger	Simpson	Yoho						
Pitts	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)						
Poliquin	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)						
Pompeo	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)						
Posey	Stefanik	Zeldin						
Price, Tom	Stewart	Zinke						
Ratcliffe	Stivers							

NOT VOTING—6

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2210

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER)
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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 193, noes 235,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

AYES—193

Adams	DeGette	Keating
Aguilar	Delaney	Kelly (IL)
Ashford	Ashford	Kennedy
Bass	Bera	Kildee
Beatty	DelBene	Kilmer
Becerra	DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick
Bera	Deutch	Kuster
Beyer	Dingell	Lance
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Langevin
Blumenauer	Bishop (GA)	Larsen (WA)
Bonamici	Blumenauer	Larson (CT)
Boyle, Brendan	Bonamici	Lawrence
F.	Boyle, Brendan	Lee
Brady (PA)	F.	Levin
Brown (FL)	Brady (PA)	Lewis
Brownley (CA)	Brown (FL)	Lieu, Ted
Bustos	Brownley (CA)	Lipinski
Butterfield	Buchanan	LoBiondo
Capps	Bustos	Loeb
Capuano	Butterfield	Loeb
Cárdenas	Capps	Lofgren
Carney	Capuano	Lowey
Carson (IN)	Cárdenas	Lujan Grisham
Cartwright	Carney	(NM)
Castor (FL)	Carson (IN)	Luján, Ben Ray
Castro (TX)	Castor (FL)	(NM)
Chu, Judy	Castro (TX)	Lynch
Ciilline	Chu, Judy	Maloney,
Clark (MA)	Ciilline	Carolyn
Clarke (NY)	Clark (MA)	Maloney, Sean
Clawson (FL)	Clarke (NY)	Matsui
Clay	Clay	McCollum
Cleaver	Cleaver	McDermott
Clyburn	Clyburn	McGovern
Cohen	Cohen	McNerney
Connolly	Connolly	Meehan
Conyers	Conyers	Meehan
Cooper	Costa	Meehan
Costa	Costello (PA)	Meehan
Costello (PA)	Courtney	Meehan
Courtney	Crowley	Meehan
Crowley	Cuellar	Meehan
Cuellar	Cummings	Meehan
Cummings	Curbelo (FL)	Meehan
Curbelo (FL)	Davis (CA)	Meehan
Davis (CA)	Davis, Danny	Meehan
Davis, Danny	DeFazio	Meehan
DeFazio	DeGette	Meehan
DeGette	Delaney	Meehan
Delaney	DeLauro	Meehan
DeLauro	DelBene	Meehan
DelBene	Dent	Meehan
Dent	DeSaulnier	Meehan
DeSaulnier	Deutch	Meehan
Deutch	Dingell	Meehan
Dingell	Doggett	Meehan
Doggett	Dold	Meehan
Dold	Donovan	Meehan
Donovan	Doyle, Michael	Meehan
Doyle, Michael	F.	Meehan
F.	Duckworth	Meehan
Duckworth	Edwards	Meehan
Edwards		Meehan

NOES—202

Adams	Ellison	Maloney,
Aguilar	Engel	Carolyn
Ashford	Eshoo	Maloney, Sean
Bass	Esty	Matsui
Beatty	Farr	McCollum
Becerra	Fitzpatrick	McDermott
Bera	Fortenberry	McGovern
Beyer	Foster	McNerney
Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Meehan
Blumenauer	Fudge	Meeks
Bonamici	Gabbard	Meng
Boyle, Brendan	Gallego	Moore
F.	Garamendi	Moulton
Brady (PA)	Gibson	Murphy (FL)
Brown (FL)	Graham	Nadler
Brownley (CA)	Grayson	Napolitano
Bustos	Green, Al	Neal
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Nolan
Capps	Grijalva	Norcross
Capuano	Gutiérrez	O'Rourke
Cárdenas	Hahn	Pallone
Carney	Hanna	Pascrell
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	Paulsen
Cartwright	Higgins	Payne
Castor (FL)	Himes	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Chu, Judy	Honda	Peters
Ciilline	Hoyer	Peterson
Clark (MA)	Huffman	Pingree
Clarke (NY)	Israel	Pocan
Clawson (FL)	Jackson Lee	Polis
Clay	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cohen	Kaptur	Reichert
Connolly	Katko	Rice (NY)
Conyers	Keating	Richmond
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Costa	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Costello (PA)	Kildee	Ruiz
Courtney	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Crowley	Kind	Rush
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Cummings	Kuster	Sánchez, Linda
Curbelo (FL)	Langevin	T.
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lawrence	Schakowsky
DeGette	Lee	Schiff
Delaney	Levin	Schrader
DeLauro	Lewis	Scott (VA)
DelBene	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
Dent	Lipinski	Serrano
DeSaulnier	LoBiondo	Speier
Deutch	Loeb	Sherman
Dingell	Lofgren	Sinema
Doggett	Lowenthal	Sires
Dold	Lowey	Slaughter
Donovan	Lujan Grisham	Smith (NJ)
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Smith (WA)
F.	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
Duckworth	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Edwards	Lynch	Takano

NOES—235

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

Yoho Young (IA) Zeldin
Young (AK) Young (IN) Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings Pearce Takai
Marino Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2213

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois
changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER)
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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 194, noes 234,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

AYES—194

Adams DeSaulnier Kilmer
Aguilar Deutch Kind
Ashford Dingell Kirkpatrick
Bass Doggett Kuster
Beatty Dold Langevin
Becerra Donovan Larsen (WA)
Bera Doyle, Michael Larson (CT)
Beyer F. Lawrence
Blumenauer Duckworth Lee
Bonamici Edwards Levin
Boyle, Brendan Ellison Lewis
F. Engel Lieu, Ted
Brady (PA) Eshoo Lipinski
Brown (FL) Esty Loeb sack
Brownley (CA) Farr Lofgren
Bustos Fitzpatrick Cuellar
Butterfield Foster Lowey
Capps Frankel (FL) Lujan Grisham
Capuano Fudge (NM)
Cárdenas Gabbard Luján, Ben Ray
Carney Gallego (NM)
Carson (IN) Garamendi Lynch
Cartwright Gibson Malone y,
Castor (FL) Graham Carolyn
Castro (TX) Grayson Maloney, Sean
Chu, Judy Green, Al Matsui
Cicilline Green, Gene McCollum
Clark (MA) Grijalva McDermott
Clarke (NY) Gutiérrez McGovern
Clay Hahn McNerney
Cleaver Hanna Meehan
Clyburn Heck (WA) Meeks
Cohen Higgins Meng
Connolly Himes Moore
Conyers Hinojosa Moulton
Cooper Honda Murphy (FL)
Costa Hoyer Nadler
Costello (PA) Huffman Napolitano
Courtney Israel Neal
Crowley Jackson Lee Nolan
Cummings Jeffries Norcross
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA) O'Rourke
Davis (CA) Johnson, E. B. Pallone
Davis, Danny Jolly Pascrell
DeFazio Kaptur Payne
DeGette Keating Pelosi
Delaney Kelly (IL) Perlmutter
DeLauro Kennedy Peters
DeBene Kildee Pingree

Pocan Schakowsky Titus
Polis Schiff Tonko
Price (NC) Schrader Torres
Quigley Scott (VA) Tsongas
Rangel Scott, David Van Hollen
Reichert Serrano Vargas
Rice (NY) Sewell (AL) Veasey
Richmond Sherman Vela
Ros-Lehtinen Sinema Velázquez
Roybal-Allard Sires Visclosky
Ruiz Slaughter Walz
Ruppersberger Smith (WA) Wasserman
Rush Speier Schultz
Ryan (OH) Stefanik Waters, Maxine
Sanchez, Linda Swallow (CA) Watson Coleman
T. Takano Welch
Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (CA) Wilson (FL)
Sarbanes Thompson (MS) Yarmuth

NOES—234

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

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings Pearce Takai
Marino Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2218

Messrs. COHEN and RUSH changed
their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER)
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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 192, noes 236,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

AYES—192

Adams Doggett Lawrence
Aguilar Dold Lee
Ashford Doyle, Michael Levin
Bass F. Lewis
Beatty Duckworth Lieu, Ted
Becerra Edwards LoBiondo
Bera Ellison Loeb sack
Beyer Engel Lofgren
Bilirakis Eshoo Lowenthal
Blumenauer Esty Lowey
Bonamici Farr Lujan Grisham
Boyle, Brendan Foster (NM)
F. Frankel (FL) Luján, Ben Ray
Brady (PA) Frelinghuysen (NM)
Brown (FL) Fudge Lynch
Brownley (CA) Gabbard Maloney,
Buchanan Gallego Carolyn
Bustos Garamendi Maloney, Sean
Butterfield Graham Matsui
Capps Grayson McCollum
Capuano Green, Al McDermott
Cárdenas Green, Gene McGovern
Cárdenas Tiberi McNerney
Carney Grijalva Meeks
Carson (IN) Gutiérrez Meeks
Cartwright Hahn Meng
Castor (FL) Heck (WA) Moore
Castro (TX) Higgins Moulton
Chu, Judy Himes Murphy (FL)
Cicilline Hinojosa Nadler
Clark (MA) Honda Napolitano
Clarke (NY) Hoyer Neal
Clawson (FL) Huffman Nolan
Clay Israel Norcross
Cleaver Jackson Lee O'Rourke
Clyburn Weber (TX) Pascrell
Cohen Johnson (GA) Payne
Connolly Johnson, E. B. Pelosi
Conyers Jolly Perlmutter
Courtney Jones Peters
Crowley Kaptur Pingree
Cummings Keating
Curbelo (FL) Kelly (IL) Pocan
Davis (CA) Kennedy Poliquin
Davis, Danny Kildee Polis
DeFazio Kilmer Price (NC)
DeGette Kind Quigley
Delaney Kirkpatrick Rangel
DeLauro Keating Kuster
DelBene Lance Reichert
DeSaulnier Langevin Rice (NY)
Deutch Larsen (WA) Richmond
Dingell Larson (CT) Roybal-Allard

Ruiz	Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen
Ruppersberger	Sherman	Vargas
Rush	Sires	Veasey
Ryan (OH)	Slaughter	Vela
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (NJ)	Velázquez
T.	Smith (WA)	Visclosky
Sanchez, Loretta	Speler	Wasserman
Sanford	Swalwell (CA)	Schultz
Sarbanes	Takano	Waters, Maxine
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Watson Coleman
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Schrader	Titus	Wilson (FL)
Scott (VA)	Tonko	Yarmuth
Scott, David	Torres	
Serrano	Tsongas	

NOES—236

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

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings	Pearce	Takai
Marino	Poe (TX)	

□ 2222

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 98 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 120, 425, 426, or 427.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply strips the dirty water riders in this bill. These four poison pill riders do not need to be in the bill. Each in its own right is a good example of a bad rider, and together they represent an assault on clean water, an attempt to forcibly supplant Agency expertise with ideology.

The first dirty water rider, section 120, undermines the Interior Department's Stream Protection Rule which updates regulations which would allow coal mining companies to pollute and often extinguish altogether our mountain streams. We need this rule, and it is sufficiently flexible to accommodate regional variability. It is stringent enough to protect the people of Appalachia from the negative health and environmental impacts of mountaintop removal mining.

The second dirty water rider, section 425, prohibits the EPA from updating the definition of fill material under the Clean Water Act. It was never congressional intent to allow mining refuse and similar material—some of it hazardous—to qualify as fill material and thereby bypass a more thorough environmental review and meet Federal pollution standards.

Downstream water users have every right to be concerned that the section 404 process fails to protect them from the discharge of hazardous substances. To freeze those definitions in time, as section 425 does, ties the hands of implementing agencies despite evolving scientific understanding and current regulatory insights. Current and future administrations must have the discretion to implement key terms and clarify them when needed.

The third dirty water rider, section 426, requires that certain dredge and fill activities be completely exempted from the permitting process. This is in

direct contravention to the text of the Clean Water Act and essentially bars the executive from being able to implement the environmental safeguards contemplated in the act.

The fourth rider, section 427, blocks the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers' Clean Water Rule, which restores critical pollution standards to our Nation's small streams and wetlands. At stake is the protection of almost 60 percent of U.S. streams. Headwaters and nonperennial streams supply drinking water to more than 117 million Americans.

American businesses need certainty. They need to know when the Federal Government has authority and when it doesn't. Without updated guidance, businesses will often not know when they need an Army Corps permit. This uncertainty will continue in the light of the recent Supreme Court decision and underscores the need for the Clean Water Rule to clarify the limits of Federal authority.

These riders are a far cry from sensible adjustments to the Clean Water Act. On the contrary, they are just the latest in a seemingly endless effort to undo clean water protections and regulatory clarity. All four of these riders are not only unnecessary, they pose a significant threat to water quality, public health, and fish and wildlife populations.

Just as important is poison pill riders like these that prevent us from doing our jobs and pass appropriations bills that have any chance of passing the Senate, any chance of being signed by our President. I urge my colleagues to oppose these riders and support this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, first, I want to point out that we have had separate and stand-alone debates on each of the provisions that the gentleman is trying to address, so obviously we have already had this debate.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Over the last few days, we have heard from our colleagues across the aisle that it is the market that is responsible for the downturn in coal, not this administration's regulations. But if you issue regulation upon regulation that completely overhauls the entire industry sector, is that really just the market at work?

Instead of acknowledging that it is the onerous regulations that play a big part in the problems impacting the coal industry, this administration has blamed coal's troubles on the market; and, incredibly, this has been what our friends on the opposite side of the aisle seem to agree with.

□ 2230

They are minimizing the devastating impacts of regulations like Office of Surface Mining's proposed stream protection rule.

So let me tell you about the real-world consequences: lost jobs, lost revenues, lost taxes, lost resources. The stream protection rule would reduce total recoverable coal by 65 percent. That means a decrease of \$3 billion in coal taxes. Our towns and counties rely on the revenue to pay for schools, police, emergency services, and so much more.

A big drop in coal production means a big drop in good-paying jobs. Over 100,000 jobs are at risk because of this rule. Coal puts food on the table, pays the bills, and supports our families.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Without the good jobs coal provides, families are having to make tough decisions, decisions that will impact these individuals' lives: How will they get their bills paid? How will they make their car payment or their house payment?

It is time we stand up for these hard-working miners, their families, and American energy. Therefore, I urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with my friend from West Virginia that it is time we stand up for coal miners and their families. It is time we stand up for their health. I don't know West Virginia's health statistics, but I do know those from southwest Virginia. They, unfortunately, have the highest negative health consequences of any counties in Virginia.

The New York Times did a story a few years ago about the 20 counties in America where the death rate was going up. Seven were in the coalfields of southwest Virginia. The incidence of sickness, birth defects, cancer, and all kinds of illnesses are much higher when you look at the streams that have been buried by coal refuse.

Let's look at this. In this so-called war on coal, no administration has put as much money into research on trying to bring coal back—coal gasification and carbon capture sequestration—trying to make coal a vital part of our economy again, without the health consequences and without environmental consequences. This is what we are trying to do.

We cherish these people also. Let's take care of them in a strong way rather than subjecting them to environmental conditions and lifestyles that destroy their lives.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, as I mentioned earlier, we already had a number of debates about each of the provisions that the gentleman is trying to

strike; therefore, this amendment is totally unnecessary. Nevertheless, the committee included each of these provisions for sound reasons, and each have their own merit. Broadly speaking, these policy provisions are included in the bill to put the brakes on flawed policies that this administration is trying to implement.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I would just agree with the distinguished chairman of this committee that, yes, we have had debates. It is important that we continue the debates, and ultimately, wisdom will emerge. It is this back-and-forth, hopefully, that gets us to the very best policies and the very best laws.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to process any application under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) for a permit to drill or a permit to modify, that would authorize use of hydraulic fracturing or acid well stimulation treatment in the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, despite technological improvements, we know that extracting, transporting, and burning oil and gas is a dirty and dangerous business. There is simply no disputing that.

Our reliance on these outdated fuel sources is placing people and our environment at risk. This is especially true for offshore drilling and the activities used to extract as much oil and gas as possible from these wells, methods such as hydraulic fracturing, called fracking, and acid well stimulation.

Offshore fracking has been occurring for over 20 years off California's coast, and yet we know very little about the impacts on our oceans. That is why, last year, I introduced H.R. 1951, the Offshore Fracking Transparency and Review Act, which would require an environmental impact statement to be produced for fracking and acid well stimulation. We simply must know more about these activities before they should continue.

While my legislation has not been afforded a hearing, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, BOEM, and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, BSEE, completed a programmatic assessment providing the first attempt to examine offshore well stimulation treatments, which resulted in a legal settlement with stakeholders in my congressional district earlier this year.

This assessment confirmed that the potential for negative impacts on the environment and wildlife from offshore fracking and acid well stimulation, as well as the many unknowns as to the extent of the impacts, are well confirmed. Despite this, they decided that a more thorough analysis of potential impacts would not be undertaken.

Regrettably, this has resulted in a missed opportunity to fully examine the risks posed by these treatments through a full environmental impact statement, as my legislation would require. Additionally, there is a severe lack of transparency as to what types of chemicals are being used for tracking and well stimulation activities and how they would be polluting our waters.

So I join my constituents in expressing significant concerns over the impacts that these activities may have on our local environment, marine life, and public health.

Given the many questions surrounding the impacts of offshore fracking activities, my amendment would prohibit the use of funds to process any application for a permit to drill or permit to modify that includes hydraulic fracturing and acid well stimulation in the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf. This would provide a pause in activities to allow us to study both the need to extend the life of these wells as well as the safety and long-term impacts of these activities.

My amendment provides a measured approach to a very uncertain practice that could have long-term and severe consequences to our oceans and public health. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. First, I want to say I have enjoyed serving with the gentlewoman from California for a number of years. We have shared many a plane

ride back and forth here to Washington, D.C., but we disagree on this issue.

In May, the Department of the Interior issued a finding of no significant impact with respect to these operations. This followed a review of 23 oil and gas platforms currently operating off the shore of California. The review drew upon the best available science and reaffirms these operations are operating as safely as they should.

The amendment is nothing more than another attempt to restrict offshore development for oil and gas. I oppose the amendment and encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, also to my colleague with whom I have enjoyed serving and with whom we share a particular affinity for a certain portion of a coastline along my district which I know he and I both appreciate, I want to close by reiterating that oil and gas extraction, transportation, and combustion is inherently risky and dirty. And this we do know. There is no denying it.

But what we don't know equally concerns me. We have very little knowledge of the long-term impacts of offshore fracking and well stimulations on our oceans and our marine life as well as our public health, yet these activities continue to occur off our coast.

□ 2240

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply provides a pause in the use of fracking and acid well stimulation on the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf so that we have the chance to evaluate the need for and potential impacts of these practices.

Let's make sure we fully understand the potential damage we are doing to our sensitive coastal and ocean environments, the species that live in them, and our public health.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to say that BSEE has done an enormous amount of study and assessment. They continue to do so as they look at the operations of oil and gas industry in California, certainly off the coast of California.

Many people don't realize how large a producer the State of California is in the oil and gas industry. It has a long history in the State of California, one of the largest oil companies in the country, Chevron, still one of the few that operates out of the State of California, and we are certainly very proud of that.

It has not been a perfect history, but the science has improved. The production practices have improved, and it is certainly an important part of our economy, and we want to make sure that they continue to operate safely. We are going to make sure that these agencies do the necessary regulatory work that they need to do.

So I am opposed to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 100 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to terminate—

- (1) the Law Enforcement and Investigations unit of the Forest Service; or
- (2) the Office of Law Enforcement and Security of the Bureau of Land Management.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will ensure that none of the funds made available by this legislation are used to abolish the Bureau of Land Management or the U.S. Forest Service law enforcement units.

BLM and the Forest Service law enforcement units are highly specialized, highly trained professionals responsible for enforcing a range of Federal laws across our public lands. These responsibilities include enforcing grazing regulations, monitoring mine safety, protecting archaeological resources, and enforcing fire restrictions.

A vote for this amendment will simply send the message that Congress supports these important responsibilities and does not condone any effort to undermine or eliminate this important Federal authority and the officers in those law enforcement units.

Today, more than ever, Federal law enforcement officers charged with protecting our public lands deserve our respect and support. Tragically marked by the illegal occupation of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge by armed militants earlier this year—an occupation, I remind you, that House Republicans refused to officially condemn—there is a growing hostility toward Federal land management and is increasingly exposing Federal law enforcement officers to violence, threats of violence, intimidation, and disrespect.

Whether it is individuals like Cliven Bundy who believe they are above the law and refuse to pay below-market, federally subsidized grazing fees, violent secessionists plotting to bomb a Federal facility, or treasure hunters determined to deface and loot precious cultural resources, law enforcement officers at Federal land management agencies enforce critical laws like the Endangered Species Act, the Lacey Act, the Native Americans Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and they deserve our support.

But despite these important functions, House Republicans aim to strip Federal land management agencies of their law enforcement authority, going so far as to introduce legislation, H.R. 4571, to completely dissolve BLM and Forest Service law enforcement authority.

To do so would be disrespectful and outright dangerous. Instead of pouring gasoline on the fire and contributing to the climate that leads to violent armed occupations, we should stand up for the integrity of the Federal law enforcement officers, and not cast them away with scorn, neglect or disrespect.

With this amendment, we have an opportunity to send a clear message that Congress supports Federal law enforcement officers and the rule of law across our public lands.

Please support this amendment to ensure that none of the funds made available by the bill can be used to abolish BLM or Forest Service law enforcement units. I urge my colleagues to support federal law enforcement officers by voting in favor of this simple, commonsense and, indeed, reassuring amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, the bill provides funds for law enforcement functions of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. Even if these agencies wanted to, they could not eliminate their law enforcement offices and responsibility. Neither could they provide more or less funding for them without the approval of the Appropriations Committee, and this committee has no desire to end the law enforcement function of either the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management.

This amendment has no purpose and, therefore, it is not needed. It is nothing more than a nuisance amendment, in my opinion. I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4571, does exactly that, strips the authority. And Congress can and has the authority to strip from law enforcement units and Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management their authority and their ability to enforce the laws that they have been responsible under their jurisdiction to enforce.

So this amendment, as I said earlier, is a reassurance that the intentions are both good intentions, to retain these services, but that, by approving this amendment, we effectively negate and hold harmless and impotent the present legislation that is out there to, indeed, get rid of these units.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, there is no need for this amendment, and I would oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 101 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

COMPLIANCE WITH GREAT LAKES COMPACT

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by a State in contravention of the interstate compact regarding water resources in the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence River Basin consented to and approved by Congress in Public Law 110-342.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this appropriations bill. While not perfect, the bill funds the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative at \$300 million so that critically important work to clean up the Great Lakes can continue.

My amendment would prohibit funds in this act from being used by States in violation of the Great Lakes Compact, an agreement among the eight Great Lakes States outlining how this precious and nonrenewable resource is to be managed.

The compact prohibits water from being pumped to areas beyond the drainage basin, and sets strict criteria for any diversion request.

To that end, a municipal government outside the basin recently had its ap-

plication approved to divert up to 8.2 million gallons per day from Lake Michigan, most of which will be returned after being treated.

This diversion request was only approved after conditions were met lowering the volume of water to be withdrawn as well as reducing the service territory it would be provided to.

□ 2250

Going forward, it will be important to ensure that the approval of this request does not set a precedent that will threaten to deplete this resource by encouraging further diversion requests that do not uphold the strict water management standards outlined in the compact. As freshwater supplies in other parts of the country and the world dwindle, the desire to divert water by tanker or the construction of pipelines could become a greater threat to the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes are a nonrenewable source. Less than 1 percent of the water is renewed annually through rainfall and snow melt. The onslaught of climate change will likely cause water levels to decline in the future. Irresponsibly diverting water from the basin could threaten the fragile ecosystem, putting fish and wildlife at risk by degrading water quality and damaging habitats.

This amendment is supported by the Alliance for the Great Lakes, the National Wildlife Foundation, and Citizens Campaign for the Environment.

[From Citizens Campaign for the Environment]

MEMORANDUM OF SUPPORT: COMPLIANCE WITH THE GREAT LAKES COMPACT
AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5538—HIGGINS

Background

While seemingly inexhaustible, the Great Lakes are truly a gift of the glaciers, as rainfall and snowmelt only naturally replenish about one percent of the water annually. Once water removal from the Great Lakes for any reason extends beyond one percent annually, lake levels will decrease. The existing strains on this fragile ecosystem, such as pollution, invasive species, and climate change, will only be exacerbated if the sheer quantity of water is jeopardized by Great Lakes water export.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact has been law in New York and the United States since 2008. The Compact is a valuable interstate agreement that builds on century-old interstate and international protections for the Great Lakes. The Compact specifies how each Great Lakes state will act to protect Great Lakes water quantity. The Compact prohibits water diversions out of the basin, with limited exceptions.

Justification

A municipal government that is considered a community in a straddling county of the Great Lakes Basin recently had its diversion application approved after strict conditions regarding the volume of water and service territory were met, among others. Going forward, it will be important to ensure that the approval of this request does not set a precedent that will threaten to deplete this resource by encouraging further diversion requests that do not uphold the strict water management standards outlined in the Compact.

Congress can help ensure compliance with the Great Lakes Compact by prohibiting federal funds from being used by states to break the strict guidelines laid out in the Compact. Predicted to be more valuable than oil, our abundant fresh water resources are the envy of many who suffer from already strained, polluted, or disappearing water resources. Congress must protect the integrity of the Compact if we are to protect Great Lakes water quantity for future generations.

ALLIANCE FOR THE GREAT LAKES,

JULY 12, 2016.

Hon. BRIAN HIGGINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HIGGINS: On behalf of the Alliance for the Great Lakes, I thank you for offering an amendment to H.R. 5536, the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill, regarding compliance with the Great Lakes Compact. The Alliance for the Great Lakes is pleased to support this amendment.

The Alliance for the Great Lakes appreciates that you recognize the importance of the Great Lakes to our region, our communities, and our way of life. The Great Lakes provide economic engines for our communities and recreational opportunities for families. They hold almost 20 percent of the world's surface fresh water and supply drinking water to more than 30 million people. In order to protect this amazing resource, the Great Lakes Compact was adopted in 2008. It provides significant protections to Great Lakes water because it prohibits diversions of Great Lakes water, with limited exceptions, and requires each state to enact water management programs for in-basin water use. Your amendment is a good reminder of how important the Great Lakes Compact is to protecting this precious natural resource.

Recently the Compact Council approved with conditions the first diversion request under the exception standards of the Great Lakes Compact. This diversion will serve the City of Waukesha, Wisconsin. Given this development, the Alliance for the Great Lakes supports your amendment that seeks to uphold the spirit and intent of the Great Lakes Compact. The Alliance for the Great Lakes and our partners will work to ensure that this diversion approval with conditions is enforced and sets a high bar for any future diversion requests.

Thank you for your continued leadership on Great Lakes issues.

Sincerely,

MOLLY M. FLANAGAN.

JULY 12, 2016.

Hon. BRIAN HIGGINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HIGGINS: On behalf of the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) and our 248,000 members and supporters in New York, we thank you for offering an amendment to H.R. 5536, The Interior and Environment Appropriations bill, regarding the Great Lakes Compact (Compact) and wish to express our support for this effort.

As you well know, our Great Lakes are a wonder of the world. They hold almost 20 percent of the world's surface fresh water, supply drinking water to more than 30 million people, and are the foundation of our economy and way of life. The Great Lakes are vast, but fragile, and are susceptible to water withdrawals and diversions. As a result, the Compact was negotiated and adopted in 2008 to help protect and sustain our Great Lakes. The Compact provides significant protections to Great Lakes water because it prohibits diversions of Great Lakes water, with limited exceptions, and promotes the wise use of in-basin water resources.

Given the recent approval with conditions of the first diversion request under the Compact by the City of Waukesha, Wisconsin, NWF supports your amendment that seeks to uphold the spirit and intent of the Compact. It is important to ensure that this diversion approval with conditions is enforced and sets the right precedent. Therefore, we share your efforts to reinforce the strength of the Compact and protect the largest surface freshwater system in our country.

We thank you for your continued leadership and look forward to working with you on this issue.

Sincerely,

MARC SMITH,

*Policy Director, National Wildlife
Federation's Great Lakes Regional Center.*

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, by prohibiting the use of funds by States in violation of the compact, Congress can send a clear message that it takes seriously its responsibility to protect the largest surface freshwater system in our Nation.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIGGINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with the amendment and am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting Chair. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR.
LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 102 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Secretarial Order 3289, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on September 14, 2009, and addressing the impacts of climate change on America's water, land, and other natural and cultural resources.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would ensure that the Department of the Interior continues to address the impacts of climate change on our public lands, on our waters, and cultural resources by maintaining a 2009 Secretarial order on climate change.

Across the country, our public lands and wildlife are often on the front lines of climate change.

Every week, we learn more from scientists about the impacts of rising levels of greenhouse gases in our atmosphere. Ocean acidification, droughts,

increased frequency of wildfires, heat waves, extreme weather events, diminished air quality, habitat loss, species migrations, and more changes than even these to our environment are occurring because of climate change.

The Department of the Interior is in a unique position when it comes to climate change because it is responsible for where fossil fuels are extracted, how fossil fuels are extracted, and the amount of fossil fuels extracted from our public lands and our waters.

Of course, fossil fuels, when burned, contribute a significant amount of climate-changing pollution to the atmosphere. In addition, the Department of the Interior is also responsible for managing much of our public lands and waters that are impacted by that damaged climate.

Therefore, the Department of the Interior should play a significant role in both promoting the transition to a low-carbon economy and mitigating the effects of climate change on our public lands and waters.

That is why I am so glad the Department is finalizing a rulemaking for renewable energy development on public lands, paving the way for massive clean energy development.

The Department of the Interior also recognizes that climate change is drastically changing the landscape and the wildlife it is working to preserve, and so the Department has taken a series of commonsense steps to protect our national resources from the impacts of climate change.

These steps include coordinating responses across multiple bureaus of the Department; communicating the science of climate change impact; establishing regional hubs to study existing climate change impacts and management strategies; engaging the public through education; developing a network of local, State, and national partners to devise strategies for responding to climate impacts; and understanding and limiting the Department's own pollution footprint.

The complexity of a changing climate require multidisciplinary teams covering large swaths of the landscape who strive to understand what is going on, respond appropriately, and adapt long-term management strategies so that the public lands, waters, and resources continue to be accessible to the public and resilient to the impacts of climate change. My amendment supports these commonsense measures to help our public lands and resources become more resilient to the impacts of climate change so that future generations will continue to benefit from our rich natural and cultural resources. My amendment also ensures that these Department of the Interior actions continue into the next administration.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Department of the Interior's efforts by voting "yes" on my amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, my friend wants to ensure that funds are being expended on efforts to address climate change. I understand that. Simply put, though, we are not here to write blank checks. Some programs may have merit; many certainly do not.

We would not be doing our jobs if we allow the Secretary of the Interior to just unilaterally make policy decisions without allowing Congress to weigh in with appropriate policy debates, and certainly, we are not going to allow a future Secretary to be bound by a prior Secretary's fiat without congressional input.

In the meantime, we must use congressional power of the purse to rein in the executive branch overreach. I would think that whoever is in power, we cannot allow an executive to continue to use executive orders in violation of the separation of powers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I remind my colleagues that these Secretarial actions that I am asking to continue have been going on since September of 2009 with approval and with oversight and reports back to this Congress. These are rational, logical steps that the Secretary has put into place.

I ask my colleague, what would you oppose? We should not communicate responses across multiple bureaus? We don't need to understand the science of climate change impacts? We don't need regional hubs to study this, which are ongoing?

All we are saying is let's continue this course of action. We need to develop resiliency. We know these impacts. The science is overwhelming. This is an ongoing activity. To deny this now means to stop what is already ongoing, and that would be a shame at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to continue the actions of the Department of the Interior to really coordinate and understand climate change impacts.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, just call me old-fashioned. I just think that the folks that are elected to office should have some authority around this town.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 103 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Executive Order 13693.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe climate change represents one of the greatest threats to our economic livelihood, our national security, and the health of the planet.

To help combat this growing threat, on February 19, 2015, the President issued a historic executive order which requires that the Federal Government commit to key sustainability goals. This executive order builds off of ongoing low-cost efforts throughout the administration to reduce emissions, save energy, and achieve key sustainability goals.

□ 2300

The efforts bolstered by this executive order have already helped Federal agencies save \$1.8 billion in cumulative energy costs. Surely we can all agree that the Federal Government, as the country's largest consumer of energy, should be a leader in cutting energy costs and saving taxpayer dollars, which is exactly what this executive order enables us to do.

Specifically, the executive order directs Federal agencies to ensure 25 percent of their total energy consumption is from clean energy sources by 2025 and reduces energy use at Federal buildings by 2½ percent per year between 2015 and 2025. These are worthy realistic goals to strive for because the consequences of not acting are dire.

Unmitigated global warming will reduce our global gross domestic product by almost a quarter in the next 80 years. As a professor at Stanford University said, we are basically throwing away money by not addressing climate change.

And to be clear, Mr. Chairman, this isn't something that only environmental groups are concerned about. Citigroup issued a report that found that minimizing temperature rises could reduce the global gross domestic product loss by \$50 trillion.

While climate change will have catastrophic long-term consequences, the effects of our warming planet are already being felt in our own backyards. Given the nature of this threat and the modest, yet worthy, goal this executive order sets to help combat the economic security and health risk climate change poses to us, I hope we can push through these commonsense measures. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, my friend wants to ensure that funds are being expended on an executive order issued by the President. Simply put, the President did not consult Congress on these executive orders. Again, call me old-fashioned, but around here you should be able to pass a law in the House of Representatives, the United States Senate, have it signed, and not do things unilaterally.

Obviously, we were not consulted. From the perspective of the majority, we have a problem with this executive order. We would not be doing our jobs if we allowed the President to unilaterally make policy decisions without Congress having the ability to weigh in with these appropriate policy debates.

In the meantime, we must use our congressional power of the purse to rein in the executive branch overreach.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman may have a little confusion and not be as concerned about funds that are expended, but really funds that are saved—the \$1.8 billion in cumulative energy costs and the billions of dollars we will save by addressing climate change. I know in 2015, in the gentleman's home State of California, they had the worst water shortage in 1,200 years, which has been intensified 15 to 20 percent by global warming. In my home State of Wisconsin, farmers are facing more pests and widespread disease from higher humidity and warmer winter temperatures.

I would argue that this isn't about spending funds. This is about saving taxpayer funds, which is what I thought people on the other side of the aisle also would want to do. I hope that the gentleman might change his mind and support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, obviously, being from California, we have our own versions of what is going on with the drought, and certainly the science that I look at is different than the gentleman's look at the science that he is at; but that is what policy debates are all about. We should debate that here in the Congress, we should debate that in the Senate, and it shouldn't be decisions that are unilaterally made by any President of the

United States. That is why we have a democracy here, not a king.

I oppose this amendment, and I encourage all of the Members here to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 104 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 441. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 102(a)(1) of Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1701(a)(1)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

The amendment is very simple. It offers a choice for those in Congress to make. It is a choice for Members to vote on whether we want to keep our public lands public or not.

Very simply, my amendment says that none of the funds available through this bill can be used in violation of the law with regard to keeping our public lands public. This amendment would not undo anything or undermine any current congressional or administrative land exchanges that are done legally.

The amendment would, however, prohibit the use of funds in this bill to pursue any extra-legal ways to turn Federal land over to private owners through various things like a commission, or others that have been espoused.

The district I have the honor of representing in Colorado is over 60 percent public lands. Public lands are not only beautiful and majestic, but they are the fundamental drivers of our mountain area economies in counties like Grand and Eagle and Summit Counties.

Public lands are good for our body, mind, and soul. A U.S. Army veteran of

the Kosovo and Iraq war who lives in Colorado recently said: "I fought to protect all that makes our Nation great, and that includes the public lands that belong to every American."

Not only are our public lands good for our souls, but they are also one of our largest economic drivers in our State and throughout the Rocky Mountain region and, indeed, across the country. Over \$646 billion is generated economically through our public lands, and visiting our public lands supports over 6 million jobs. From small businesses to ski resorts, from gas stations to diners, our economy thrives largely in part because of the public lands in areas like the one I have the honor of representing.

A recent poll across six Western States revealed that 96 percent of Americans support protecting public lands for future generations. Clearly, it is a top priority for our families. People want to see our public lands stay public and they want to see the maintenance for access of outdoor areas on our public lands as a critical focus of the Federal Government.

States simply don't have the resources to take on the responsibilities for maintaining and keeping our Federal lands safe. Selling these lands outright to private owners would undoubtedly lead to loss of access, loss of jobs, devastate our economy, and hurt the quality of life in districts like mine.

If you talk to the people on the ground who use these lands, whether it is sportsmen and recreational shooters, hikers, bikers, campers, hunters, or motorized activists, they don't want our land, the land they use, taken away from them. Obviously, those concerned with environmental well-being, water quality, and public health also strongly support our public lands.

With this amendment, I offer a clear choice to my colleagues. Support the protection of public lands and let's cast a vote to do that. I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that current law regarding public lands must be followed. There is nothing in this bill that contradicts that. We are not going to be getting rid of public lands in this bill. As such, there is no purpose or relevance for this, so I would oppose this. I think this is trying to get people all excited that we are going to be getting rid of public lands in this bill, which is not true.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I, again, thank the gentleman that there is not any sale of public lands in this bill. I would point out that there are Members in this body—in fact, the chair of

the authorizing committee in this general area—who speak regularly about privatizing our public lands, so there is a real threat. This is not simply something that comes out of nowhere. I think the peace of mind that we would get by including this kind of language in an appropriations bill would make it very clear that Congress supports the opinion of the American people, supports the economy in districts like mine, and wants to keep our public lands public.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2310

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, there is no need for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 105 printed in House Report 114-683.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Dog Management" published by the National Park Service in the Federal Register on February 24, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 9139 et seq.; Regulation Identifier No. 1024-AE16).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this bipartisan amendment to the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act to ensure my constituents and those who visit the Golden Gate National Recreation Area will be able to enjoy the park as it is intended to be enjoyed.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area is in the bay area and was envisioned to have multiple complementary uses. This is enshrined in its mission statement "to preserve and enhance the natural, historic, and scenic resources of the lands north and south of the Golden Gate for the education,

recreation, and inspiration of people today and in the future." However, the National Park Service is moving forward on a severely restrictive rule on an activity that many bay area residents presently enjoy in the GGNRA, and that is dog walking.

Dog walking off leash has been allowed in certain areas of the GGNRA for 40 years, but under a new proposed rule this amendment addresses, it would dramatically restrict access. While the NPS wants to treat all parks the same, the GGNRA has enjoyed off-leash walking for decades with little or no problems. As one of our Nation's few urban parks, it requires dog rules that fit the unique place in our community.

I have heard from literally thousands of San Francisco and San Mateo County residents who oppose the rule. Dog owners certainly must act responsibly. As a dog owner myself, I understand that I must make sure my dog is well trained and safe for all visitors to the GGNRA. I don't think all of the GGNRA should be open to off-leash dogs, only designated off-leash areas that won't impact our native wildlife and flora and fauna.

I love my dog, Buddy, a beautiful yellow Lab. I love walking him, and he certainly enjoys the fresh air and being off leash and free to roam. So this amendment is for Buddy and for all the "Buddies" in the bay area that enjoy the GGNRA. Buddy has been there for me, and, tonight, I am here for him and for all of his four-legged buddies.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SPEIER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. If you come by my office, the gentlewoman can meet our dog, Callie, whom we refer to as the "barker of the House." As a fellow dog lover, I have no problem with the gentlewoman's amendment and would happily support it.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, in reclaiming my time, I will accept that on behalf of the 200,000 dogs in San Francisco and the many more in San Mateo County, and I thank the gentleman for his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 106 printed in House Report 114-683.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 302(a) of Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1732(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman

from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, many of our Nation's public lands, those lands which belong to all Americans, are managed under a multiple use mandate. This means that they are managed to support a wide variety of uses, including hunting, fishing, hiking, and other recreation activities, alongside responsible energy development, the preservation of historic and cultural resources, the conservation of some of our Nation's most iconic landscapes, and wildlife habitat protection.

The resource management plans that were recently finalized by the Bureau of Land Management to protect the greater sage-grouse and the broader sagebrush sea landscape strike the appropriate balance between the many uses of our public lands. The plans, which were developed in close consultation with the States and which reflect an unprecedented collaboration among stakeholders, allow for the responsible resource development, recreation, and preservation of the habitat which the greater sage-grouse requires to survive and thrive.

Without these plans, it is highly likely that the greater sage-grouse would need to be listed under the Endangered Species Act. However, language in the underlying bill blocks funds from being used to implement the resource management plans, upsetting the carefully crafted balance that is required under the multiple use mandate. This harmful provision could also put the many other species that depend on this landscape at risk, including elk, mule deer, and pronghorn antelope; and it would deprive hunters and other outdoor enthusiasts of opportunities to use their public lands and enjoy the benefits of renewable wildlife resources.

This is why hunters and sportsmen across the West support the sage-grouse conservation plans and strongly oppose any effort to block the plans from moving forward, including groups such as the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, the Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, the Archery Trade Association, and the Dallas Safari Club, just to name a few. My amendment would allow the BLM management plans to go into effect if failing to implement the plan would impact the multiple use mandate and, thereby, deprive outdoor enthusiasts of their ability to use these Federal lands.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which protects opportunities for sportsmen and sportswomen and other outdoor enthusiasts, who depend on our public lands.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, of course the Federal lands are managed according to current law, and current law requires that they be managed for sustained yield and multiple use. There is nothing in this bill that contradicts that—nothing. There is no purpose for this amendment, so I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act requires the Bureau of Land Management to manage the public lands it administers according to two principles, as we both agree: multiple use of the landscape and sustained yield of renewable resources.

Multiple use and sustained yield mean balance. Opportunities to hunt, fish, and watch wildlife are just as important and have just as much legitimacy under the laws as activities like grazing, mining, logging, and drilling. Unfortunately, the balance has swung too far toward the second set of activities, resulting in significant damage to wildlife habitat and diminished uses and yields for people who wish to enjoy the outdoors.

Updating and implementing resource management plans is critical to maintaining balance and complying with the law. In this case, it not only guarantees that those who wish to enjoy the great outdoors can do so, but, in complying with the multiple use mandate, it does all that is necessary to prevent the greater sage-grouse from being listed under the Endangered Species Act.

This very balanced plan recognizes the needs and interests of all parties who seek to use these lands so as not only to protect the great sage-grouse, but to make sure our sports enthusiasts also have access to it. The failure to implement this plan could put all of those uses in danger.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 111 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 12, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 30, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$1,750,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

□ 2320

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, in a bipartisan effort with ANN KIRKPATRICK, we are offering this amendment. It is an amendment on behalf of Native American schoolchildren dangerously rutted in flood-prone dirt roads that cause Native American kids to miss school, on an average, 10 days a year. I have one of the pictures here of a whole series. You can take the whole seasons here and you can see what these bus routes are like.

When it rains, when it snows—and it does in parts of Utah and Arizona—you look at the Navajo Nation and you are going to find that kids are missing 10 days a year on average because of roads like this.

Now, the funding for the BIA to take care of these roads has not changed since 1988. We are asking for a modest shift of less than \$2 million to deal with this situation.

I have a county in my district, a county that is larger than the State of New Jersey, and yet, the population there is less than 15,000 people. That is a tremendous tax burden for them to try to maintain such massive roads. It is hard to imagine sometimes on the East Coast how massive some of these areas are, but they need a little maintenance money for these roads and for these schoolchildren.

So I have joined with ANN KIRKPATRICK in offering this amendment. I would encourage Members to vote for it. It is less than \$2 million. It will make a huge difference on the Navajo Nation, in particular, where we desperately need to make sure that kids can get to school in a consistent manner. We have dealt with the funding for nearly 30 years at the same level. It is time to make that adjustment. I would encourage Members to vote in favor of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's legitimate concern for the condition of BIA roads, but reluctantly must oppose this amendment because it takes even more money from an already starved EPA.

EPA's main operating account is already cut by \$92 million in the bill. Amendments have cut an additional \$116 million. Again, while I share the concern that the gentleman has, the fact is that the bill already provides \$30 million for BIA road maintenance. This is \$3.2 million more than the budget request.

So although road maintenance is critically important, I cannot support the offset. I oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's amendment. I have experience firsthand with Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, as a matter of fact, and with Ms. MCCOLLUM. We were at the Navajo reservation about a year ago, and my back is still hurting from the road that we were on. It was quite an experience.

So they need help. I think this is a very modest amount of money. I appreciate the support that our colleagues give to Indian Country. They certainly deserve it.

I would encourage adoption of this amendment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the distinguished ranking member.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), we agree that these roads need to be fixed. In fact, Chairman SIMPSON and I, just sitting on the bus, we did 500 steps. I had one brand of tracking equipment, and he had another. I won't mention the names here.

We are not opposed to fixing these roads, but we just wanted to take an opportunity on this amendment to point out how much has already been cut from the Environmental Protection Agency. They have had \$164 million cut. There have been other cuts that have come through. At the same time, Members come to the floor and complain that they haven't done the delisting, and they haven't been out there, and they haven't checked this out, and they haven't done this, and they haven't done that. Well, we need to give them the tools in the toolbox.

We know that this amendment is going to pass. We hope that the schoolchildren arrive to school safely. As a teacher, I want them there every day to be educated, but we really need to figure out a way to fund some of these other projects besides already taking out an already pared-down Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I think you would find the mutual bipartisan approach to achieve the goal. I don't think anybody is in opposition to this.

The reality is, in nearly 30 years, the funding level hasn't changed. It is very modest. It is less than \$2 million.

I hope people find it in their heart to let this pass. It makes a world of difference to people. We can debate about where to pull those funds. I have offered this amendment in a bipartisan way from this fund. It is the way it is structured, and I do hope it passes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, again, I fully respect the gentleman's concern.

Although he says this is a modest offset, that may be true, but we have one modest offset on top of another modest offset on top of another modest offset. Before you know it, the EPA is just starving and cannot do its mission.

I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 113 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$468,000)(increased by \$468,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is nearly identical to an amendment that passed by voice vote last year. I hope we will agree on its passage again this year.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Florida wants to cut it short, I will accept the amendment right now.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MR. NORCROSS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 114 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 74, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$15,282,000) (increased by \$15,282,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would designate an additional \$50 million within the Superfund accounts specifically for the enforcement division.

This amendment does not take money from other programs. Rather, it

designates a portion of already allocated monies for enforcement. It is revenue neutral and would equal the amount the EPA said it needs to hold accountable those companies which have polluted the lakes, streams, and even the homes of my constituents and our constituents.

As I mentioned yesterday, there are still well over 1,000 active Superfund sites across this great Nation. In my district alone and home to the author of the Superfund bill, there are over 13 sites that are still contaminated today.

I want to tell you about just three of those sites, in particular, named for the company responsible for dumping lead and arsenic into the ground, streams, and the lakes. It is called the Sherwin-Williams Sites. These sites include Sherwin-Williams/Hilliard's Creek Site located in both Gibbsboro and Voorhees, the Route 561 Dump Site in Gibbsboro, and the United States Avenue Burn Site, which is in Gibbsboro.

Early in the 1930s, Sherwin-Williams purchased a former paint and varnish manufacturing plant in Gibbsboro and expanded their operation throughout that facility. For 20 years, the company allowed these chemicals from their synthetic varnish to be disposed of in that area. The contamination happened not only at the manufacturing plant, but in two separate disposal sites, dump sites that they created. Just one of the Sherwin-Williams disposal methods included pumping sludge into holes in the ground around the property.

These chemicals from the varnish seeped into the groundwater, contaminating not only that property, but properties and streams around the entire area.

□ 2330

The facility was closed in 1977, and Sherwin-Williams tried to pass the bag by selling the property to a developer in 1981. The soil in the groundwater beneath these sites is contaminated with chemicals, including lead and arsenic, which have devastating effects on both human health and children's development. After the devastating events in Flint, Michigan, I know we understand so many of the horrific effects of lead exposure, but I think it bears repeating what my constituents and Americans across the country are facing.

Lead exposure can have serious long-term health consequences in adults and children. Even at low levels lead in children can cause IQ deficiencies, learning disabilities, impaired hearing, many of those things that we have heard about over the past few months. It also leads to problems in pregnant women and also harms fetuses. According to EPA, long-term exposure to high levels of arsenic can lead to skin lesions and a variety of cancers, including skin, bladder, and lung cancer.

We must hold companies like Sherwin-Williams accountable for the havoc that they have caused in both

Gibbsboro and Voorhees. For almost 40 years, this ground has laid there. For the author of the Superfund bill, Jim Florio, this was one of the driving forces for writing this, and yet 40 years later it stays there, still not being addressed by the company that caused it. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, Jim Florio was a good friend of mine, a great guy.

As I mentioned during the debate on the gentleman's previous Superfund amendment, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's support for robust funding for the Superfund program, particularly the cleanup program. I agree, we need to make progress to address the backlog of 1,300 sites, as the gentleman mentioned, on the national priorities list, and the bill proposes to do so with the \$40.1 million increase for cleanup work.

However, the gentleman's amendment proposes to increase EPA's enforcement budget by \$15.2 million, offset by other reductions within the Superfund account. Presumably, those reductions would come at the expense of the cleanup program. So I reluctantly oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no." Certainly, I sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do, but we just don't agree to the offset. I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. Jim Florio's vision, unfortunately, caused by this site, just being one of many in New Jersey and in this site, but the fact of the matter is we have to hold accountable those companies that are still active, that are still making profits today while the cause that they had in these two particular sites still go unaddressed. Forty years, the company is still making money, still not being held accountable. This is one way we can start holding them accountable.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Again, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 116 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 91, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 95, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 96, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment along with my colleagues Mr. PETER KING of New York and Mr. RAUL RUIZ of California. The amendment is small, but its impact is large and very important to our three districts and many others across the country that have rural towns with volunteer fire departments.

All this amendment does is increase funding for the Volunteer Fire Assistance grant program from \$13 million to \$15 million. VFA funds are awarded to volunteer fire departments that protect small communities of less than 10,000 people and help them prepare to respond to wildfires.

Sadly, I have a perfect example of this need in my district right now. The small town of Nederland in Boulder County, Colorado, is battling the Cold Springs forest fire, with the fire crews largely made up of volunteers, initially. As just one example, Charlie Schmidtman, who is a captain with the Nederland Fire Protection District, and Bretlyn Schmidtman, who is an ER nurse, a paramedic, and volunteer firefighter already lost their home to the Cold Springs fire, even as they continue to work to save neighbors' homes. It is this sort of heroic work that we need to support through the funding that they need so they have the tools that they need to fight fires swiftly and effectively.

For some reason, we still don't treat fires the way we treat other natural disasters. Wildfires are underfunded when it comes to mitigation, prevention, and suppression. Fires often occur in rural communities with smaller populations.

The Volunteer Fire Assistance program is critical to moving the needle on wildfire management, preventing large wildfires from getting out of hand while they are still small. Though this grant program is small, its impact is incredible. The Volunteer Fire Assistance program provides matching funds to volunteer fire departments protecting communities with 10,000 or fewer residents.

Volunteer fire departments provide nearly 80 percent of the initial attack on wildfires across the United States, but, unfortunately, these volunteer fire departments frequently lack significant financial resources. \$2 million may not sound like a lot in this town, but it makes an enormous difference for our volunteer fire departments across the country.

In recent years, the threat of wildland fires has increased steadily across the country. The 10-year average cost to the Federal Government of suppressing wildland fires continues to go up; but instead of funding communities that might be able to suppress the fires in the initial phase, we have been underfunding that very program that can save taxpayer money by preventing large forest fires.

I ask for your support for this amendment, which has been endorsed by the National Association of State Foresters and International Association of Fire Chiefs, in adding \$2 million to this program.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. This is a good amendment. We are willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman for accepting this important amendment on behalf of the many small towns and volunteer fire departments across the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 119 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by the Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the modification to boating restrictions contained in the news release issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled "Minor Modification to Boating Restrictions at Havasu Wildlife Refuge" and dated May 20, 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a commonsense, bipartisan amendment. The Gosar-Sinema-Cook-Kirkpatrick-Amodei-Buck-Cramer-Duncan-Franks-Jones-McClinton-Schweikert-Zinke-Salmon-Heck amendment will assist with keeping Lake Havasu open for all users.

On May 20, 2015, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service issued new motorized boating restrictions that arbitrarily expanded a no-wake zone on Lake Havasu, a renowned fishing and boating destination on the Colorado River popular with visitors from Arizona, California, Nevada, and around the world. These arbitrary wake restrictions effectively prohibited tubing, waterskiing, and wakeboarding in an area utilized by recreational enthusiasts for decades. This action was taken behind closed doors with no advance notice and without opportunity for public comment.

These new mandates were announced and implemented just 2 days before Memorial Day weekend, an economically vital weekend, as tourists spend more than \$200 million annually in the area and support 4,000 full-time jobs. Further, 75 percent of tourists are interested in waterskiing and recreational boating activities while visiting Havasu.

The Service has attempted to justify the May 2015 “temporary restrictions” by stating that they are necessary to address safety concerns. The Arizona Game and Fish Department recently submitted formal comments refuting this claim, stating there were only four incidents in the last 3 years in the area—three groundings and one swamping.

The Department went on to state: “The temporary restriction imposed in May 2015 . . . includes a safe, traditional, very popular waterskiing and wakeboarding flat-area . . . [The Service] does not adequately justify this additional restriction and that the impacts to the recreational area would be significant . . . The reported events do not support the existence of a safety concern.”

□ 2340

On April 12, 2016, the Service announced a draft recreational boating compatibility determination and the agency’s intent to pursue even more boating restrictions on Lake Havasu. Due to significant opposition, which included more 1,000 concerned citizens showing up at a public meeting, the Service suspended the agency’s pursuit of the April 12 proposed restrictions.

While this action was welcomed, the Service still has not reopened the area closed on May 20, 2015, that started this very controversy. These temporary restrictions have now been in effect more than a year.

In addition to being arbitrary, unwise, and unsafe, the action by the Fish and Wildlife Service was also unlawful. The agency violated the law by not going through the regular NEPA process and soliciting public comment from stakeholders.

Such irresponsible action by Federal bureaucrats should alarm not only the visitors to Lake Havasu, but Americans who value the rule of law and a government accountable to the people it serves.

This bipartisan amendment is endorsed by more than 20 local and national organizations, including Americans for Limited Government, the Arizona Game and Fish Department, Concerned Citizens for America Arizona Chapter, the Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce, the Yuma County Chamber of Commerce, New Mexico Federal Lands Council, and many, many more.

My amendment is about government accountability. It simply prohibits a press release from closing an area on Lake Havasu that has been utilized by recreational enthusiasts for decades. The Service should solicit public comments and go through the normal scoping process before making major changes that impact users on Lake Havasu.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their time and for their goodwill on this bill.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, just so I can make a comment and share a concern.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I am from a water State. I am from Minnesota. And I know that sometimes boating becomes an issue where it hasn’t been an issue before because of popularity and the number of people coming to an area.

So sometimes our State DNR or sometimes, in our State, it is actually municipalities that oversee some of the waterways, or we have a park board that oversees it. Sometimes we have to go back and we have to reexamine what is going on because of the way that something has just caught on with people coming. And the more people that are in an area in water, whether it is swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, sometimes it becomes that, all of a sudden, this resource where there was plenty of room and opportunity for everybody to do what they wanted to do, now we finding people are on top of each other. And then you add the fact that this is a body of water—and I have pictures up here—where you also have wildlife habitat.

So I hear clearly what you are saying, that it doesn’t appear that the people in the area who have recreated in this wildlife refuge felt they were given much advanced notice or much input on in this.

Here is the concern that I have about us taking a vote here on this. I think you raise legitimate concerns. I think we need to make sure that it is addressed. But I don’t want to start having every refuge start being managed by Members of Congress.

I think you show that you have a lot of people in support of what you are doing. It is bipartisan in nature. The way that it appears that the Fish and Wildlife Service handled it wasn’t in an

open process where people either understood what they were doing or could comment on what they are doing. But when we come to the floor here and legislate this, I think it sets kind of a bad precedent.

So the question I have to the gentleman: Do you really feel you need to pass an amendment to legislate this? I am willing to work with you on this. Is there a way that we can get the achieved goal and objective that you are seeking and making sure visitors’ safety and recreational use is preserved but preserved in a way that is safe and enjoyable for everyone? A part of this is that there is multiple use with more people coming in a confined area.

I understand your frustration. That is why you are here on the floor. But I am wondering if there is a better way you can accomplish the goal.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The issue is very interesting, because we actually issued a FOIA request for emails. This was done egregiously by two people complaining.

If you look at the map, what ends up happening by closing this area where families and young kids learn how to water-ski, it forces them into the main channel of the Lake Havasu area, where boats go 50 to 70 to 75 miles an hour. People are going to get hurt.

So my point is if the Fish and Wildlife Service doesn’t want us to continue to do this, then do their job right. Follow the law. That is the key here.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, and this is why I think it becomes a little cumbersome. When you have people swimming and fishing and water-skiing all in the same area, there is more and more pressure on it. So I just rose in opposition to have a discussion to understand this issue better.

With that, I withdraw my opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the dialogue back and forth. Once again, let’s follow the rule of law. If the agency doesn’t want to have incidents like this and have their hands slapped publicly, then do their job and do it right and do it well. This is about safety, but it is in the reverse fashion.

With that, I appreciate the work of the gentlewoman and the chairman.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. WEBER OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 120 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 321(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7621(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a very simple and commonsense amendment to H.R. 5538, the Department of the Interior and EPA appropriations bill.

This amendment passed by a voice vote last year, and I hope all Members can support it again today—or should I say tonight.

America's job creators have faced an onslaught of regulations from the EPA, Mr. Chairman, even as Congress has consistently reduced the Agency's budget year after year. The EPA has proposed lower national ozone standards, regulations on new and existing power plants, regulations on waters of the United States, just to name a few.

All of these regulations are based on questionable scientific data and will lead to higher energy prices for hard-working families and small businesses and, without a doubt, will negatively impact American jobs.

The Agency has cited its authority under the Clean Air Act as the basis for many of its regulatory actions. However, when it comes to evaluating how its regulations impact American jobs, the Agency has failed to follow the law.

Section 321(a) of the Clean Air Act clearly states: "The Administrator shall conduct continuing evaluations of potential loss of shifts of employment . . . including, where appropriate, investigating threatened plant closures or reductions in employment allegedly resulting from such administration or enforcement."

Mr. Chairman, the EPA is even now involved in ongoing litigation for its failure to comply with this provision, and Congress has repeatedly heard testimony reinforcing EPA's failure to comply with section 321(a).

In response to questions for the record during her Senate confirmation hearing, Administrator McCarthy said that the "EPA has not interpreted section 321(a) to require EPA to conduct employment investigations in taking regulatory actions."

□ 1150

Mr. Chairman, Congress put this provision into the Clean Air Act for a reason: to provide a necessary check on the regulatory powers of unelected bureaucrats at the EPA. In response to the EPA's refusal to follow the law, Congress must act to ensure that the true impact of regulations on jobs are disclosed to inform the public and Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I was trying to figure out exactly what this amendment does. So, under the Clean Air Act, the EPA is required to evaluate potential loss or shifts of employment as a result of air pollution regulation. No one is disputing that requirement.

So this would tell the EPA that they are not allowed to spend any funds in the course of not doing any analysis. It is just illogical to prohibit the agency from spending money not to do something, but it is also pointless.

The employment impact analyses are already required under the Clean Air Act. The agency regularly undertakes them as part of rulemaking.

Mr. Chairman, why I look baffled is this amendment is impractical, and it is unnecessary. So it appears to me it is just another attempt to come to the floor and undermine the EPA's efforts to make sure that they are able to do their job.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. She actually raised a good argument for the amendment. I mean, we are telling the EPA that they need to do their job. No money can be spent in contravention of section 321(a). They can't go after a company, for example, if they haven't done the job analysis, and that is exactly what this amendment says.

So I simply want to reiterate what I said. The law says the administrator shall conduct continuing evaluations of potential loss of shifts employment. I don't understand what the administrator does not understand about "shall."

So it is a commonsense amendment. It actually reins in the EPA and keeps them from destroying more jobs as they seem wont—have the habit—to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEG0

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 122 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue a graz-

ing permit or lease in contravention of section 4110.1 or 4130.1-1(b) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will reaffirm Congress' support for the enforcement of grazing fees on public lands.

Grazing on public lands is a privilege, not a right. Ranchers who use these lands should abide by the law and pay their fair share. My amendment simply confirms that grazing permits or leases should not be issued to anyone who does not comply with BLM regulations.

Mr. Chairman, revenues from grazing fees go toward the management, maintenance, and improvement of public range land. The mass majority of ranchers are upstanding, responsible Americans. They understand the importance of these efforts and pay their fees on time.

But some ranchers are outright refusing to pay their grazing fees. That is completely unacceptable.

To be clear, my amendment does not penalize people for forgetting to repair a fence or neglecting to make a payment once or twice. Instead, this amendment will ensure that egregious violations of grazing regulations are not financed by the American taxpayer.

One particular rancher, who is well known to the media, continues to be more than \$1 million in arrears. He has ignored the executive and judicial branches of our government, expanding his herds further on to Federal lands.

While continuing to violate the law, he put the lives of local and Federal officials at stake during a dangerous standoff, for which he was indicted by a grand jury on charges including assaulting and threatening Federal officers. We are only now beginning to see the full extent of the damage he has caused to public lands as a result of this confrontation and his unauthorized grazing.

Mr. Chairman, my friends on the other side of the aisle talk a lot about upholding the law, yet they responded with silence, or even support, when this particular rancher and others brazenly broke our laws and put the lives of BLM officers at risk in an armed standoff.

Mr. Chairman, I can't help but notice a double standard in Republicans' support for ranchers who refuse to pay their fair share and Republican criticism of Americans who refuse to accept injustice in their communities.

This amendment offers my Republican friends the opportunity to stand up against those who have broken our laws with impunity. It sends a clear signal that egregious violations of grazing regulations will not be financed by the American taxpayer, and

it projects a clear message of support to the BLM officers who demonstrated discretion and restraint in the handling of the ranchers' protests.

Mr. Chairman, let's pass this amendment and uphold the basic principle that our laws should be applied fairly to everyone who lives in this country and uses its public lands.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLEGO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I certainly agree with the gentleman that permit holders should meet all their existing requirements in order to renew their permits, and I would accept this amendment.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO).

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 123 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property;

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill considered under an open rule under the 113th and 114th Congresses and, in the last few weeks, under a structural rule. If it is accepted, I will not ask for a recorded vote.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I like the gentleman's amendment. Criminals shouldn't get contracts. I accept the amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 130 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 130 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Bureau of Land Management to study or test the feasibility of, or implement, any sterilization program for wild horse and burro management with surgical sterilization.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, wild free-roaming horses and burros are a living symbol of the historic and pioneer spirit of the West, like in my home State of Colorado.

□ 0000

My amendment will help to prevent the Bureau of Land Management from destroying this iconic symbol using funds allocated in this bill to be used for surgical sterilization of horses.

What distinguishes America's wild horses from their domestic counterparts is their natural behaviors and their complex social organizations. Surgical sterilization will take the wild out of wild horses by removing the horse's ability to utilize the reproductive organs that drive their natural behavior and changing their hormonal structure. It turns them into little more than pasture horses, destroying their complex social organizations and inalterably changing the free-roaming behaviors that Congress sought to protect when we passed the Wild and Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971.

The way surgical sterilization of our horses is conducted under the guise of population control is simply cruel. A 2013 National Academy of Sciences study report identifies many strategies for fertility control and supports the use of PZP, or immunocontraception, which has been underutilized.

Rather than using taxpayer funds and do expensive roundups and expensive operations, we have effective dart-delivered birth control that is a fraction of the cost and is more humane and preserves the wild character of the herds. The National Academy of Sciences notes that sterilization is the least recommended of the approaches. There is not good data, it is untested in wild horses, and the risks associated are simply unnecessary.

BLM noted that fertility control is viable if used appropriately. It is important to maintain the population size of these herds. Of course, we can agree that some form of fertility control is needed.

Sterilization affects both male and female wild horses. In both cases experts have flat out said they are bad ideas. Ovariectomies, tubal ligations, and laser ablation are planned techniques to be used on wild horse mares. Two of the three techniques have never been performed on horses, let alone wild mares and fillies.

The National Academy of Sciences, once again, stated clearly that castrating stallions will cause loss of testosterone and consequential reduction in or complete loss of male type of behaviors necessary for maintenance of social organization, band integrity, and expression of a natural behavior repertoire. Scientists believe this mass sterilization program could essentially lead to the end of wild horses and burros in the West.

Luckily, BLM does have a better and cheaper tool. The PZP birth control vaccine is an example. It is deliverable by a remote dart. It is relatively cheap—\$25 a dose. The surgical interventions cost far more.

Numerous studies have demonstrated the cost effectiveness and efficacy of this vaccine in managing wild horse populations. But instead of expanding its use, the BLM has incorrectly reduced it over the last several years. Contraception alternatives have been available since the 1980s. But BLM, unfortunately, continues to ignore this approach despite the National Academy of Sciences report indicating these vaccines are the most promising fertility control methods to help limit the population growth for wild horses and burros.

Examples of successful use of PZP has been noted in the McCullough Peak herds in Wyoming and Assateague herds in Virginia and Maryland.

Look, these kinds of procedures destroy the wild nature of horses. They are a waste of taxpayer money, and they are inhumane. The National Academy of Sciences advised against the surgical removal of ovaries, warning

the possibility that ovariectomies may be followed by prolonged bleeding or infection makes it inadvisable for field application.

The final point I want to make is that this proposal by BLM has raised overwhelming opposition by the general public for whom our wild horses and burros are very popular. Over 20,000 citizens submitted comments in opposition to this plan. The public wants its wild horses protected, and, of course, we need to control the population, but we should not surgically mutilate our wild horses.

I would like to ask for the ranking member and chairman to work with me to make sure the BLM spends our taxpayer money more wisely and protects the iconic symbol of the American West.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I do so for the purpose of speaking to this problem we have.

I certainly thank my colleague from Colorado for his willingness to work with the subcommittee in agreeing to withdraw the amendment later in this discussion. I fully understand his concerns regarding the Bureau of Land Management's research program for wild horses and burros.

I value wild horses and burros. They are certainly, as you mentioned, an iconic part of our history in the West. But we have a problem, and I think we can agree to that. Right now we are spending \$80 million a year.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, obviously not to speak in opposition, but to speak for the purpose of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, right now we are spending \$80 million a year in this appropriation bill. It will double to \$160 million in 4 years to store horses that we are presently doing. Also, as the gentleman is aware, we are concerned not just about the health of the herds—some of these herds are in very poor health—but also about the health of the range. Some areas are way overutilized.

So we need to work with the gentleman to find out a way to deal with this problem because we just can't continue to ignore this issue. It is a growing problem.

I was just over in Death Valley. We have in some cases irreversible environmental damage that is being done by wild burros in Death Valley. So I look forward to working with the gentleman to resolve this problem.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his commitment to work with us protecting wild horses.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 131 will not be offered.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Com-

mittee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PEARCE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of representing constituents in business outside of Washington, D.C.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 12, 2016, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 4372. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

H.R. 1777. To amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4960. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, as the "Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, July 14, 2016, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign travel during the second quarter of 2016, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DANIEL SILVERBERG, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 4 AND APR. 8, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel Silverberg	04/04	04/08	India	1155.00	13505.00	14660.00
Committee total					1155.00		13505.00				14660.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL SILVERBERG, June 15, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ALBANIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 26 AND MAY 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mike Turner	05/27	05/30	Albania		831.00		7055.00				7886.00
Hon. Tom Marino	05/27	05/31	Albania		1108.00		13196.00				14304.00
Hon. Jim Sensenbrenner	05/27	05/30	Albania		831.00		15222.00				16053.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ALBANIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 26 AND MAY 31, 2016—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Rob Bishop	05/27	05/31	Albania		1108.00		13264.00				14372.00
Jessica Calio	05/26	05/30	Albania		1108.00		7664.00				8772.00
Janice Robinson	05/26	05/31	Albania		1385.00		13196.00				14581.00
Ed Rice	05/26	05/31	Albania		1385.00		13196.00				14581.00
Committee total					7756.00		82793.00				90549.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER, June 22, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Tom Price	3/31	4/2	Philippines		605.84		(³)				605.84
	4/2	4/7	Australia		1,631.00		(³)				1,631.00
Hon. Ted Lieu	5/29	6/2	Taiwan								
	6/2	6/5	South Korea		842.14		2838.66				3,680.80
Committee total					3,078.98		2,838.66				5,917.64

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. TOM PRICE, Chairman, June 28, 2016.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6023. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-552; Mississippi [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5573; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6024. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31074; Amdt. No.: 3694] received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6025. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31073; Amdt. No.: 3693] received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6026. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class C Airspace; Capital Region International Airport, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4452; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWA-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6027. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Taos, NM [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0526; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-3] received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6028. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following South Dakota Towns; Belle Fourche, SD; Madison, SD; Mobridge, SD; and Vermillion, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0525; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-1] received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6029. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class C Airspace; Billings Logan International Airport, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0149; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWA-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6030. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ash Flat, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4235; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-6] received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6031. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lisbon, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2015-5800; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-21] received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6032. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-6602A, R-6602B, and R-6602C; Fort Pickett, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7005; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AEA-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6033. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Harlan, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2016-3108; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-16] received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6034. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Charlottesville, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8304; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AEA-15] received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6035. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Walla Walla, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3675; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-19] received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6036. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace for the following Tennessee Towns; Jackson, TN; Tri-Cities, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0735; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-2] received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6037. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E

Airspace; Ogden-Hinckley, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0021; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ANM-1] received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6038. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-5811; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-158-AD; Amendment 39-18489; AD 2016-08-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6039. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Little Rock, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3085; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-2] received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6040. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3990; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-255-AD; Amendment 39-18478; AD 2016-08-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6041. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3982; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-098-AD; Amendment 39-18503; AD 2016-09-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6042. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6147; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-021-AD; Amendment 39-18506; AD 2016-09-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6043. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Orlando, FL; and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gainesville, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0071; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-1] received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6044. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Destin, FL; Duke Field, Eglin AFB, FL; Revocation of Class D Airspace; Eglin AF Aux No 3 Duke Field, FL; and Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Eglin Air Force Base, FL; Eglin Hurlburt Field, FL; and Crestview, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7203; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-14] received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6045. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7490; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-40-AD; Amendment 39-18500; AD 2016-09-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6046. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lisbon, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2015-5800; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-21] received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6047. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EVEKTOR, spol. s.r.o. Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4230; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-041-AD; Amendment 39-18539; AD 2016-11-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6048. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4813; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-161-AD; Amendment 39-18532; AD 2016-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6049. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31077; Amdt. No.: 3696] received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6050. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; B/E Aerospace Protective Breathing Equipment Part Number 119003-11 [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2134; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-012-AD; Amendment 39-18547; AD 2016-11-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6051. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8138; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-112-AD; Amendment 39-18522; AD 2016-12-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6052. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31080;

Amdt. No.: 3699] received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6053. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS AIRCRAFT LTD. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5284; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-006-AD; Amendment 39-18550; AD 2016-12-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6054. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31076; Amdt. No.: 3695] received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6055. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Aircraft Equipped with BRP-Powertrain GmbH and Co KG 912 A Series Engine [Docket No. FAA-2016-4878; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-18551; AD 2016-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6056. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BLANIK LIMITED Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4233; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-003-AD; Amendment 39-18540; AD 2016-11-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6057. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6899; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-066-AD; Amendment 39-18558; AD 2016-12-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6058. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6900; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-064-AD; Amendment 39-18559; AD 2016-12-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6059. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3987; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-066-AD; Amendment 39-18544; AD 2016-11-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6060. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3635; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-037-AD; Amendment 39-18553; AD 2016-12-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6061. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GROB Aircraft AG Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-7057; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-017-AD; Amendment 39-18557; AD 2016-12-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6062. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8130; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-175-AD; Amendment 39-18534; AD 2016-11-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6063. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0150; Amdt. Nos.: 21-99, 43-48, 61-137, 91-343, 101-9, 107-1, 119-18, 133-15, and 183-16] (RIN: 2120-AJ60) received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6064. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2958; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-248-AD; Amendment 39-18545; AD 2016-11-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6065. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8466; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-045-AD; Amendment 39-18542; AD 2016-11-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6066. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-5810; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-116-AD; Amendment 39-18526; AD 2016-10-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6067. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0464; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-046-AD; Amendment 39-18549; AD

2016-11-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6068. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EVEKTOR, spol. S.r.o. Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4232; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-043-AD; Amendment 39-18538; AD 2016-11-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6069. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes Docket No.: FAA-2015-7533; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-080-AD; Amendment 39-18528; AD 2016-11-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6070. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-8137; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-104-AD; Amendment 39-18561; AD 2016-12-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6071. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7491; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-39-AD; Amendment 39-18569; AD 2016-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6072. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Powertrain GmbH & Co KG Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2016-2042; Directorate Identifier 2016-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-18568; AD 2016-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5745. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on certain trading transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr.

BEYER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KEATING, MISS RICE of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. FARR, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 5746. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit wellness programs from sharing personally identifiable information related to individuals' use of or prescriptions for contraceptives; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RIGELL, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. BENISHEK):

H.R. 5747. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve solvency and stability for future generations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. NEAL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 5748. A bill to establish the Adams Memorial Commission to carry out the provisions of Public Law 107-62, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 5749. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to create offenses for the interstate coercion of sexual acts, sexual contact, or sexually explicit visual depictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5750. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to limit the use of centralized mail delivery for certain residential housing units, to prevent the taking of private property from homeowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ZINKE, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 5751. A bill to provide that any State whose wildlife agency has determined that a portion of the State is within the current range of the Shiras Moose may take management actions on certain Federal lands within that State to stem decline of that species' population in that State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HARDY, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 5752. A bill to promote conservation, improve public land management, and provide for sensible development in Pershing County, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5753. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to State and local law enforcement agencies for research, training, and acquiring non-lethal force methods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 5754. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 5755. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to provide students with annual estimates of student loan borrowing costs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 5756. A bill to establish Federal-State higher education financing partnerships to drive down the cost of tuition for millions of American students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 5757. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 5758. A bill to maximize land management efficiencies, promote land conservation, generate education funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 5759. A bill to amend chapter 2 of title I of the United States Code to establish the style for amending laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 5760. A bill to require all bills, resolutions, and other documents of Congress to be created, transmitted, and published in searchable electronic formats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. BERA (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 5761. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit penalty-free in-service retirement distributions for employees serving as mentors; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5762. A bill to improve the safety of hazardous materials rail transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 5763. A bill to clarify the treatment of certain DNA Specimen Provenance Assay

tests as reasonable and necessary for the diagnosis or treatment of illness for coverage under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5764. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude Federal Pell Grants from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 5765. A bill to amend and reauthorize the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 5766. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide citizenship for certain children of United States servicemen born overseas during the Vietnam and Korean Wars; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 5767. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit hospitals in all-urban States to be considered Medicare dependent hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 5768. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into intergovernmental agreements to provide for health screenings in communities near formerly used defense sites that have been identified by the Secretary as sources of perfluorooctanesulfonic acid and perfluorooctanoic acid; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 5769. A bill to require each owner of a dwelling unit assisted under the section 8 rental assistance voucher program to remain current with respect to local property and school taxes and to authorize a public housing agency to use such rental assistance amounts to pay such tax debt of such an owner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Miss RICE of NEW YORK:

H.R. 5770. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a dental insurance plan to veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 5771. A bill to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 5772. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a system to educate individuals approaching Medicare

eligibility, to simplify and modernize the eligibility enrollment process, and to provide for additional assistance for complaints and requests of Medicare beneficiaries that relate to their enrollment in the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 5773. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to include certain insular areas of the United States in the definition of State for the purposes of chapter 114, relating to trafficking in contraband cigarettes and smokeless tobacco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 5774. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow small business concerns, homeowners, or nonprofit entities to use certain Superstorm Sandy grant funds or other disaster assistance received to repay certain disaster assistance provided by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 5775. A bill to establish the American Fisheries Advisory Committee to assist in the awarding of fisheries research and development grants and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 5776. A bill to reauthorize and amend the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue and Response Grant Program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5777. A bill to provide for the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Alaska for the construction of a road between King Cove and Cold Bay; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 5778. A bill to designate Alex Diekmann Peak in Montana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania

(for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the American Tree Farm System; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship Program and recognizing the significant contributions of Albert Einstein Fellows; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCHENRY,

Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NUNES, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution expressing support for fostering closer economic and commercial ties between the United States and the United Kingdom following the decision of the people of the United Kingdom to withdraw from the European Union; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H. Res. 825. A resolution recognizing the increased risk of sleep apnea among soldiers returning from active duty and the benefits of continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) therapy on treating obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) in soldiers suffering from Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD); to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 826. A resolution electing the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. YOHO, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROSS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DENT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DOLD, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. GIBSON):

H. Res. 827. A resolution condemning the terrorist attack on the Pulse Orlando nightclub, honoring the memory of the victims of the attack, offering condolences to and expressing support for their families and friends and all those affected, and applauding the dedication and bravery of law enforcement, emergency response, and counterterrorism officials in responding to the attack; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Homeland Security, 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. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FLEMING (for himself and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H. Res. 828. A resolution impeaching John Andrew Koskinen, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself and Mr. MARINO):

H. Res. 829. A resolution expressing support for completion of President Obama's Export Control Reform Initiative, which will fundamentally reform the United States export control system and enhance United States

national security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H. Res. 830. A resolution calling for all parties to respect the arbitral tribunal ruling with regard to the South China Sea and to express United States policy on freedom of navigation and overflight in the East and South China Seas; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself and Mr. WALBERG):

H. Res. 831. A resolution promoting awareness of motorcycle profiling and encourage collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause I, Section 8, of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 5746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 5747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article one grants Congress authority over taxation

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 5748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 5749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 5750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 & Article I, Section 1, Clause 1

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 5751.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment—United States Constitution

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 5752.

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. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 5753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 5754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 5755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 and Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 5756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 5757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 5758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment, United States Constitution

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. AMASH:

H.R. 5759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution states: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States . . ." It is both "necessary and proper [for Congress to make laws] for carrying into Execution" this Power (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18), including setting standards for the format and content of legislation proposed to be considered by Congress.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 5760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, of the Constitution states: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States . . ." It is both "necessary and proper [for Congress to make laws] for carrying into Execution" this Power (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18), including setting standards for documents produced by Congress.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 5761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 5762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 5763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 5765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 5766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 and Amendment I, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 5767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 5768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 5769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 5770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 5771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5772.

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. SABLAN:

H.R. 5773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execu-

tion the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

“The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.”

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 5778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 430: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 446: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 525: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 556: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 664: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 670: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 793: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 879: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 915: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 921: Mr. KEATING, Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 923: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1095: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1205: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1284: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1310: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1460: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1516: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1559: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1728: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1781: Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1854: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1943: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 2016: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2058: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 2096: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2132: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2140: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 2173: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KIND, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2302: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2350: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 2403: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2446: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2477: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2493: Mr. NADLER and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2694: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2726: Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ZINKE,

Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BRAT, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 2737: Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2799: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 2849: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2889: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2903: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2948: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 3011: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 3012: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 3229: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 3238: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3308: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 3323: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3411: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3445: Mr. FARR and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3455: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3546: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3582: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 3673: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 3687: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3713: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3742: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LONG, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 3765: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 3815: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 3882: Mr. CAPUANO and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3886: Ms. NORTON and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3892: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 3929: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4005: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4019: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4043: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4165: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 4177: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 4385: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 4463: Mr. REED, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 4479: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 4488: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4514: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 4526: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4542: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4603: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 4614: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 4621: Ms. DELAURO and Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 4622: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 4625: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 4626: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 4681: Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 4715: Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 4816: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4893: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 4927: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4938: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 4954: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. Cartwright.

H.R. 4998: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 5007: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5008: Ms. MOORE and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 5015: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 5025: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. SPEIER.

- H.R. 5095: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 5101: Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 5102: Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 5103: Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 5108: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 5122: Mr. REED, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. COLE, and Mr. FLEMING.
 H.R. 5133: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
 H.R. 5149: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 5167: Mr. GUINTA.
 H.R. 5177: Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 5180: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PALMER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 5182: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 5187: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
 H.R. 5204: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 5265: Mr. POCAN and Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 5272: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 5295: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 5334: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 5369: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 5373: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 5392: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. FARR, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 5396: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 5409: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. PITTENGER.
 H.R. 5457: Mr. SALMON, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 5474: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 5488: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 5500: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 5506: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 5515: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 5561: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 5573: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 5578: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 5584: Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 5587: Ms. FOXX.
- H.R. 5591: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. VELA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BABIN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 5593: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 5619: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 5620: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 5624: Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 5625: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 5628: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. KUSTER, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 5646: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PALMER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 5650: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H.R. 5654: Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H.R. 5659: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H.R. 5675: Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 5682: Mr. TAKAI and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5683: Mr. FORBES, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. DENHAM.
 H.R. 5685: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 5689: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 5691: Ms. GRANGER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 5697: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
 H.R. 5715: Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 5720: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
 H.R. 5722: Mr. PETERS, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. PLASKETT.
- H.R. 5727: Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 5732: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 5734: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.R. 5739: Mr. HIMES.
 H. J. Res. 22: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. VARGAS.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. COOPER.
 H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H. Res. 14: Mr. ZELDIN.
 H. Res. 94: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H. Res. 110: Mr. KNIGHT.
 H. Res. 112: Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H. Res. 130: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H. Res. 220: Mr. REICHERT.
 H. Res. 334: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H. Res. 467: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H. Res. 590: Mr. FOSTER.
 H. Res. 617: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H. Res. 631: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H. Res. 670: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H. Res. 683: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H. Res. 686: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Res. 754: Mr. KILDEE.
 H. Res. 784: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. BONAMICI.
 H. Res. 795: Ms. GABBARD.
 H. Res. 808: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H. Res. 810: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. ROSKAM.
 H. Res. 811: Mr. NADLER.
 H. Res. 813: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
 H. Res. 817: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HARDY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. PITTENGER.
 H. Res. 824: Mr. CONYERS.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 2016

No. 113

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Living God, we bless Your Holy Name. We praise You for the abundance of Your love and for Your peace that transcends understanding. Lord, even in the midst of the cacophonous, You permit us to hear Heaven's harmonies.

Today, inspire our lawmakers to depend on Your grace. As they rely on Your promises, empower them to obey Your precepts, finding in Your wisdom a lamp for their feet and a light for their path. Sustain them with Your sweet presence when they walk on weary roads, and continue to bless them with the constancy of Your love. Send Your Spirit to bring quiet and serenity into their souls.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

UNITED KINGDOM'S NEXT PRIME MINISTER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Queen of England will ask Theresa May to form a government and

become the United Kingdom's next Prime Minister.

Our allies, the British, have stood with us through the toughest of times and remain a valued ally and partner. This was true under Theresa May's predecessor as Conservative Party leader and Prime Minister—that is David Cameron, to whom we also send warm regards today—and it was true under the preceding Labour governments of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown as well. We have every expectation it will be true under her leadership as well.

From what I hear, May is tough, savvy, and she has promised to seek unity and “a strong . . . positive vision for the future” of her country.

So on behalf of the Senate, allow me to wish her the best in the days to come.

LEGISLATION BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Republican-led Senate will have two opportunities to make a difference for the American people by passing the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act conference report and the bipartisan, bicameral aviation agreement. Both bills are the result of months of hard work from colleagues on both sides. With continued cooperation, we can move these measures across the finish line now.

The CARA conference report is a comprehensive legislative response to the prescription opioid and heroin epidemic which is devastating our Nation. By increasing prevention, treatment, recovery, and law enforcement tools, CARA can help prevent more people from struggling with addiction to begin with and it can help foster long-term healing for those already struggling with addiction.

It is no wonder it has earned the backing of nearly 250 groups, from local hospitals like the Kent County

Memorial Hospital in Rhode Island to law enforcement groups like the Fraternal Order of Police and antidrug groups like Voices of Hope in my own State of Kentucky.

At a time when drug overdoses claim 129 American lives every single day, it is painfully clear we need to do more, and we need to do it now. That is why this Senate majority has provided more than double the funding the previous majority provided for opioid-related issues. That is why this Senate majority has made passing this comprehensive response a priority.

I particularly want to thank those who made this moment possible, Senator PORTMAN, Senator AYOTTE, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator ALEXANDER. I also appreciate those on the Democratic side who worked very hard on this bill, such as Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator KLOBUCHAR. I know they are all proud to support it today.

We can also pass the bipartisan, bicameral aviation bill, which is an important step to ensuring safety and security for American travelers. Recent terror attacks, such as those at airports in Brussels and in Istanbul, underline the significance of this bill, which represents the most significant airport security reform in a decade.

By shoring up security for international flights coming into the United States, by enhancing vetting for aviation employees, and by improving security in prescreening zones that are often vulnerable, the airport security bill before us will take more steps to protect airline passengers.

The bill will also take steps to keep Americans safe from active shooter threats by authorizing more so-called VIPR teams. It will also make sure airports are better equipped to respond and disarm threats that come their way by bolstering resources and training for security personnel.

In addition to these smart security enhancements, the bill also includes a number of key items to improve safety

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5019

in our skies, such as ensuring that unmanned aerial vehicles don't interfere with emergency response and improving mental health screening for pilots. It includes a number of consumer protection provisions, too, such as refunds for lost or delayed baggage and improvements to travel for disabled passengers and parents with small children.

I especially thank Senator THUNE for guiding this critical bill through the legislative process and for his work to include even more security provisions to keep Americans safe.

Every Senator should support this bill today so we can send it to the President's desk immediately. With cooperation now, we can finish our work on these critical bills. With continued cooperation in the coming days, we will be able to finish our work on other important legislation as well.

For instance, yesterday we voted to go to conference on the Energy Policy Modernization Act, which represents the first broad energy legislation to pass the Senate since the Bush administration. By updating and reforming our energy policies and infrastructure, this bill can help Americans save more energy, produce more energy, and pay less for energy.

This much needed legislation wouldn't have been possible without the resilient efforts of the Energy Committee chair, Senator MURKOWSKI, and the ranking member, Senator CANTWELL, to move it forward. I am pleased the Senate took the next step to advance this bill, and I hope we can arrive at a final agreement in the near future.

Unfortunately, there are areas where our colleagues have blocked critical progress on issues such as Zika control funding and support for our veterans. Here was the headline in a newspaper this week: "Reid: Senate Dems will block Zika funding again." "[W]hich means," the article explained, "there will be no further avenues to pass a funding bill to combat Zika for the rest of the summer."

Democrats used to say Zika was an imminent threat. Now they are threatening to extend the filibuster of the funding we need to fight Zika and protect women's health. Why? It seems clear enough. They think dysfunction works well for them politically, so they are trying to manufacture some regardless of who gets hurt in the process. They have tried to muddy the issue with extraneous arguments and half-truths, but they just don't stand up to serious scrutiny.

Let us examine a few of the things they have said about this compromise conference report. Our Democratic friends pretend it would underfund Zika. Actually, it contains the exact \$1.1 billion funding they just voted for last month.

Democrats pretend it contains partisan offsets. Actually, the offsets have bipartisan buy-in. Two of the three offsets have explicit bipartisan support.

The third takes unspent money that was set aside for health care in the territories but cannot be used and actually uses those funds for—get this—health care in the territories.

Democrats pretend the compromise conference report would weaken clean water protections. Actually, it temporarily—just temporarily—waives a duplicative paperwork provision that Democrats themselves call "unnecessary for the protection of our environment" and a "waste of taxpayer dollars." This temporary provision would only apply to pesticides already approved—already approved—by the EPA, and it represents the only real way to commence with the kind of anti-mosquito efforts we need—efforts the EPA Administrator herself assures us are not only safe but "perhaps the most important tool we can use right now"—as the vaccine takes a period of time to develop.

Democrats also pretend the compromise conference report would prohibit funding or deny access for birth control. Actually, it provides more resources for health care, including preventive care, than the Zika bill Democrats voted for just last month. This compromise bill directs those health care dollars to the very places you would expect, such as hospitals, public health departments, community health centers, and Medicaid.

Democrats are now upset because a political supporter doesn't get a special carve-out, so they are demanding an earmark for this partisan group as the cost of ending their attack on women's health and their blockade of anti-Zika funding. Of course, Democrats would like us all to ignore the fact that the very same partisan campaign organization would not have been able to access these Medicaid funds in the President's Zika request either.

So it is hard to decide which of these excuses is the most disingenuous. Maybe it is the false claim this bill cuts funding for veterans. It actually increases veterans funding to record levels, by the way. Just as Democrats are pushing a partisan proposal to provide political cover on Zika, it actually would leave veterans funding behind.

So, look, I think we get this. Democrats have a partisan interest in blocking critical anti-Zika funding. That is what is going on here, but Americans are asking them to please just put politics aside for once and think of the national interest. Does anyone—anyone—seriously believe pregnant mothers care about manufactured squabbles over offsets and earmarks and duplicative paperwork? They want Washington to kill mosquitoes and they want them to do it now. They want to see a vaccine developed—and quickly. They want to see their unborn babies protected from a devastating virus that can have lifetime consequences. What they do not want to see, what they are not interested in observing, is one more manufactured partisan excuse from our colleagues over here on the other side.

To quote the top Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations, "Mosquitoes don't care about the budget process." She is right.

The time for games is over. This is our chance to pass anti-Zika funding, and there is only one way to do it. Vote yes on the compromise Zika control and veterans conference report before us and send it on down to the President.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

LEGISLATION BEFORE THE SENATE AND JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Republican leader celebrates the opioid legislation and the FAA bill, but both are missed opportunities. There is no funding in the opioid bill. There were editorials all over the country yesterday about that. I read here on the Senate floor, it is in the RECORD, about The New York Times saying it was really wrong to try to claim credit for doing something on opioids when there is no money to do it.

The FAA bill—I will talk about that in a little more detail in a little bit—is another missed opportunity to do what is right to help, to help the Republican leader keep his word.

CARA, the opioid legislation, has no real funding to solve the real problem.

Over the last week, Democrats have exhausted every avenue to try and work with Republicans on a Zika funding measure. Democrats had the audacity to expect the Republican leader to live up to his promise in April of bipartisan work on Zika. This is what the Republican leader said in April:

We all are very much aware that this is a serious crisis. We'll be working with the administration, with Democrats.

But his actions, especially over the last couple of weeks, clearly illustrate that he was never really interested in a bipartisan solution. For example, the President offered a meeting with Senator McCONNELL, Speaker RYAN, Secretary Burwell, and Director of OMB Shaun Donovan, to work on the Zika crisis. The Speaker and the Republican leader refused that meeting. We offered to reintroduce the Senate's bipartisan Zika compromise from what we sent to the House. We would do it again as a freestanding bill. That bill had 89 votes. Eighty-nine Senators voted for it.

We have offered Republicans legitimate compromises in the hopes they would join us at the negotiating table, but it is clear that they don't want to stay in DC. They want to rush to Cleveland and wave the flag for Donald Trump. That is why they are imposing imaginary deadlines on Zika legislation.

The Wall Street Journal reported yesterday that “Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL today rejected that offer, saying the time for such negotiations had passed”—talking about our offer, our latest offer. The Republican leader is saying there is no time to work on Zika. Well, I would suggest that I disagree with that.

Starting this Friday—right here, July 15—we are going to begin the longest recess in the Senate in 60 years. Sixty years ago, there was not much going on in this country, relatively speaking. We had far fewer people, 100 million fewer people. We had a less complicated government in many ways, so there was an opportunity at that time to take the time off, but 60 years later, there is no time to do that.

To say there is no time to work on Zika—give us all a break. There is plenty of time—7 weeks, to be exact. I guess a couple months of paid vacation is more important than protecting pregnant women and their babies from the terrible birth defects caused by Zika. There is no reason we can’t stay here and work on protecting women and their babies, but Republicans are in such a hurry to coronate Trump in Cleveland, they are willing to sacrifice helping their constituents.

The Republican leader announced yesterday that he will be speaking at the Republican convention next week. I guess the Republican leader is rushing for the exit without funding Zika so he will have time to prepare his speech and polish it because I am sure it will really help Donald Trump a lot in his election efforts. The Republican leader cares more about his time off and cheering Donald Trump than protecting the women of America and their babies from this horrible virus.

Let’s be clear. It is obvious that Republicans are choosing Trump and some time off over protecting American women from the Zika virus. This is a really bad, revolting set of priorities, and every Republican in this building and the office buildings surrounding this Capitol should be ashamed. They shouldn’t fool themselves—every Republican in Congress should know that if they walk away without funding Zika, the repercussions are going to be severe.

I can’t recall ever, having been around here a long time—even before I came to Congress, I worked here—watching a party so willingly move to its own destruction. That is what Republicans seem to be intent on doing. Maybe they don’t like being in the majority. It is hard to be in the majority. We are trying to save the Republicans from themselves, but they won’t let us. We have pursued every avenue possible to find a bipartisan Zika bill path forward that can pass both Houses and be signed by the President. It shouldn’t be hard. Women and babies across America are counting on Republicans to come to their senses and pass a bill before we leave here on a 2-month vacation, but if Republicans refuse, if they

can’t see the writing on the wall, we can’t make them read the writing on the wall. It is up to them to open their eyes and read the writing on the wall.

Look at the time we have to do something on Zika. Look at the time—July 15, August. See all these big black lines? We are not here. We come back on September 6. July is gone, August is gone, and part of September is gone. We have a lot of time to be here and do some work.

I say to my Republican colleagues, sit down with us. We have offered compromise after compromise. To hear my friend talk about, oh, I can’t understand why they won’t accept preventing Planned Parenthood from taking care of these women—if there were ever a time in the history of America where women wanted to do something about birth control, how about now?

My Republican friend says: I don’t understand why they are concerned about Planned Parenthood not being able to take care of these women. I don’t understand why they are concerned about changing the environmental laws dealing with the Clean Water Act. I don’t understand that.

Their legislation takes \$500 million from veterans that we were going to use to process claims. For him to come and say we are increasing veterans money is just not true. Everyone knows that the \$543 million they have here is an offset from ObamaCare. I could raise a point of order right now, and it would fall automatically. Everyone knows that. Taking money from Ebola—there is not much left there. Ebola is still a crisis. We know that. We remember that from 2 years ago.

But what is always so interesting is why in the world, if they are so interested in doing something about this, would they stick a provision in their legislation that they reinstate the ability to fly the Confederate flag over military cemeteries? How is that for a compromise?

So this calendar is going to stay here. Let’s look at it for a while and see what time we have left. The Republican Senate is being defined by its unfinished business. It is not just Zika; we could go on for quite some time. I will mention a couple things.

How about giving serious consideration to protecting Americans by funding our military and our national security, addressing gun violence, or providing the necessary resources to attack our Nation’s opioid crisis.

Through their historic inaction, Republicans are refusing to treat the Federal judiciary with the respect it deserves and the Constitution demands. The senior Senator from Iowa has turned the once proud and independent Judiciary Committee—my friend—we have been together for 34 years in the Congress of the United States—the senior Senator from Illinois is a member of that committee. He loves his work on that committee; he has told me numerous times. But that once proud and independent Judiciary Committee has

been turned into a partisan Republican opposition research operation. The Republican Judiciary Committee now has a singular focus: winning the White House for Donald Trump.

The Judiciary chairman has wasted millions of taxpayer dollars trying to embarrass Hillary Clinton during her stalwart term as Secretary of State of this great country. They failed, of course. Senator GRASSLEY wrote countless letters demanding State Department documents. He even once went after a woman who worked at the State Department and was having a baby. He wanted the records to make sure he could document that. He scoured sensitive records belonging to Secretary Clinton’s aides. He was obsessed with digging up political dirt. He found none. But, like the Benghazi Committee in the House, Senator GRASSLEY has wasted millions of taxpayer dollars and produced zero. Now that the FBI has closed the book on Secretary Clinton’s emails, Senator GRASSLEY is resorting to questioning the integrity of career FBI officials, calling their investigation “suspect.”

Senator GRASSLEY’s efforts to elect Donald Trump don’t end with his partisan attacks regarding Secretary Clinton. The senior Senator from Iowa has obstructed qualified, consensus judicial nominees in the hopes that Trump will win in November and remake the judiciary in his image. Think about that. Unlike past Judiciary Committee chairs, Senator GRASSLEY is content to put partisanship above a functioning judiciary.

The number of vacancies under President Obama has skyrocketed. Republicans’ obstruction is putting them in the history books—but for the wrong reason. Last year, Senate Republicans made history by confirming the fewest judges in a long time. This year, they seem determined to shortchange the judiciary even further. We have a myriad of judicial emergencies around the country, meaning the judges can’t get their work done. These courts have more cases than judges can handle, and that has more than doubled.

Justice is being denied for millions of Americans, but under Chairman GRASSLEY, the Judiciary Committee spends its time playing politics, not confirming judges. It seems the only thing deserving the chairman’s attention is electing Donald Trump, ensuring he gets as many judicial appointments as possible. Nowhere is that more apparent than with the current vacancy on the U.S. Supreme Court and GRASSLEY’s obstruction of the highly qualified Chief Judge Merrick Garland. No one can find anything dealing with his education, his qualifications, his judicial temperament, his integrity—he is top of the line, as was indicated some time ago by ORRIN HATCH.

President Obama nominated Garland 100 days ago. He serves as the chief judge of the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. He was unanimously rated as

“well qualified” by the American Bar Association—the highest rating possible. By any measure, he is exactly the type of fairminded, consensus nominee the Senate should be considering for the vacancy. But Judge Garland can’t make his case to the American people because Senator GRASSLEY refuses to even hold a hearing on the nomination. Chairman GRASSLEY has come up with a myriad of excuses to block the nomination, none of which hold water. As the Des Moines Register said recently, “Grassley’s excuses are purely political.”

Iowans aren’t being fooled. They know that the chairman’s real goal is holding the Supreme Court open for Donald Trump to do with what he wants. The Judiciary chairman has already said Trump would “appoint the right type of people”—boy, I will tell you, that must be a real stretch—“the right type of people” to the Supreme Court. The senior Senator from Iowa obviously places a high value on Trump’s judgment, which has proven to be so good the last year. Senator GRASSLEY is holding a Supreme Court vacancy for a man who accused an Indiana-born judge of being unable to do his job because of his racial heritage. His parents came from Mexico. Apparently he would like to see that brand of thinking brought to the Nation’s courts.

It is time for Senator GRASSLEY to stop playing politics with his committee and give Judge Garland a fair hearing. It is time for his committee to address the numerous lower court vacancies and damaging judicial emergencies throughout the country. The American people deserve a functioning judicial system led by the Judiciary Committee in the Senate. They have had enough with Republican excuses. Iowans and the Nation are waiting. It is time for Senator GRASSLEY and Senate Republicans to do their job.

Mr. President, I would ask the Chair to announce what the Senate is going to do the rest of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 524, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

Conference report to accompany S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11

a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Illinois. Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is an important bill. It is a bill that relates to the opioid epidemic in America—an epidemic which is linked directly to the heroin epidemic in America and the sad reality of the deaths that are occasioned by heroin overdoses.

The prescription opioid and heroin epidemic claimed 28,647 American lives in 2014—1,652 in my State of Illinois. That is a 30-percent increase in just 4 years.

I have seen this devastation firsthand. I have sat with parents who have lost their kids. I have met with young teenagers who were addicted. Thank goodness that some of them have been able—with treatment, counseling, and strength—to fight off that addiction.

The reality is obvious. This narcotics epidemic is not an inner city problem. It is an American problem. It is a problem that not only touches the inner cities of America, but it also touches every other community. There is no town too small, no suburb too wealthy to escape the opioid and heroin epidemic.

I have been across my State, from one end to the other, at roundtables with law enforcement, with medical professionals, with those who do addiction treatment and with those who have lived through these addictions. I have seen firsthand what it has done to communities and families and lives. We need a forceful response, and we are going to vote on one in about an hour. It is called the CARA bill. It is a bill that moves us in the right direction when it comes to dealing with this addiction.

The conference report has many important elements to it, and that is why I am going to support it. It includes my proposal to require reforms at the FDA, or the Food and Drug Administration, to ensure better oversight of dangerous and addictive opioid drugs before they are approved for sale in our country. My provisions will ensure the FDA convenes scientific advisory committees before approving new opioid drugs and that the Pediatric Advisory Committee has a voice in the decision.

We require the FDA to consider the public health impacts before allowing more addictive products to come onto the market. We direct Federal health agencies to develop plans for continuing medical education with doctors and other providers who prescribe opioids. We require the FDA to encourage drug companies to make abuse-deterrent formulations of these dangerous drugs.

The CARA conference report also includes a proposal I have worked on to improve State prescription drug monitoring programs. This legislation will make it easier for States to share information about overprescribing and overusing opioids, it gives doctors more information to better perform their prescribing practices.

I am pleased the CARA conference report includes new grant programs to expand access to naloxone—the life-saving anecdote—to promote treatment alternatives instead of arrests for those suffering from addiction and to create flexibility and treatment options for those who need medication-assisted therapy or pregnant women who need specialized care.

Having said all of these positive things about what we are to vote on, let me state the obvious. When only 12 percent of the people in Illinois are able to receive care for their addiction, and there is a 12-week wait at facilities for vulnerable patients to get into drug treatment, authorizing new programs, which this bill does, is good but not good enough. We need to make an investment. We need to put taxpayers’ dollars behind this commitment to end this epidemic, and it is needed now.

That is why Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN of New Hampshire offered an amendment during the Senate floor consideration of this bill. Her amendment would have put \$600 million into actually making the bill work, enforcing it, investing in it. It failed.

During the CARA conference meetings, Senator MURRAY and Congressman PALLONE offered amendments to ensure that Congress would put some money into the promise of this bill. They couldn’t get it passed in a conference dominated by the Republican majority. Why? Why would these efforts be blocked when the Republicans are joining us and saying this is a national problem that deserves our immediate attention? Because Republicans have said they have already proposed to increase funding in appropriation bills to take care of this. Yet many Republicans are supporting a continuing resolution that freezes funding at this year’s level and provides for no increase in opioid epidemic treatment. When they say they are going to put more money in and then call for a continuing resolution, they know and we know that it is a sham.

The Republicans are opposing an increase in funding for this bill by saying they already proposed increased funding in another bill, but at the same time they are advocating a freeze, or flat-funding a continuing resolution. They can’t have it both ways.

It is confusing, but those of us who live in this world know what they are up to. They want to take the credit for passing this bill and the promise of funding it in the future into the election in November but not provide the money that is needed to make it work. That is playing games with people’s lives. America deserves better.

Failing to provide the dollars today is not going to help those who are currently suffering. It is not going to help that mother who was awake all last night worrying about a son or a daughter who is facing an addiction, praying they can get that child they love into treatment in time to break that addiction and save their lives.

You know what else is missing from this CARA conference report? Many of these measures in the bill deal with addiction after it has taken hold. We have to do things to prevent addiction on the front end. The best way is to ensure people don't get addicted in the first place. I have introduced the Addiction Prevention and Responsible Opioid Practices Act, or the A-PROP Act. It is going to help shut off the spigot for fueling this crisis.

Here is something most people don't understand or realize. The Drug Enforcement Administration sounds like the kind of law enforcement agency that polices America to reduce the likelihood that narcotics are going to be found in our homes, in our neighborhoods, in our communities, and in our States. It also has another responsibility. Each year pharma, the major pharmaceutical companies, comes to this agency and asks for the approval to make even more narcotics. These are prescription narcotics like opioids. The DEA has to sign off on this increase in production each year.

If we are going to take a look at the seriousness of this opioid problem and its growth in America, take a look at the growth of production in America that has been approved by this Federal agency. Between 1993 and 2015, the Drug Enforcement Administration-approved quotas for oxycodone increased almost 40 times. In 1993, they were producing about 3½ tons of these opioid pills. Now they are producing 150 tons of these opioid pills.

The DEA has approved pharma to produce enough opioid narcotic pills to provide—listen closely—every adult in America a 1-month prescription each year to opioid narcotics—every adult in America. That goes way beyond any medical need. It is pharma's effort to make more money and to feed the beast of this opioid epidemic, and DEA each year gives the seal of approval. That is wrong.

Once these pills are produced, it takes a doctor or a dentist or some other authorized medical professional to prescribe them. How they are making it through that process onto the streets and into the homes of America is the next question beyond this DEA approval of pharma's overproduction.

We need continuing medical education to be mandated. Incidentally, DEA approves doctors to give them the authority and power to prescribe narcotics. They can monitor this, as well, and see where the abuse is taking place. We need an all-hands-on-deck approach to this epidemic. Each stakeholder needs to play a role.

I am going to vote for this CARA conference report. On its face, it is hard to vote against, but I want to do it with the knowledge of having said in this statement on the floor that it isn't enough. Unless we pass Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN's amendment, unless we follow up on Senator PATTY MURRAY's amendment in conference and fund this effort to stop this epidemic, we are ba-

sically sending a very nice greeting to America that we recognize the problem but we are not paying to solve it. People across America understand this epidemic. It is time for us to take it seriously, not for political posturing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank my colleague from Illinois for his remarks on the funding issue. I couldn't agree more.

There is no question that this body should be working to help curb opioid abuse in this country, to improve mental health services, to improve the way we treat addiction and speed up recovery. Everyone in this Chamber knows it. But the bill before us, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, is woefully insufficient for dealing with the opioid and heroin crisis. It makes a whole lot of changes, but it doesn't support a single one with new resources.

It would authorize block grants to States to treat people who are hooked on these dangerously addictive prescription painkillers, but it doesn't provide any actual money to give. It would authorize programs to help law enforcement crack down on this scourge, but it doesn't provide a single plugged nickel to our cops.

Without actual appropriations, this bill is like a Hollywood movie set—something that appears real on the surface but has no substance and no life behind its facade. Let me say that again. Without actual appropriations, this bill is like a Hollywood movie set—something that appears real on the surface but has no substance and no life behind its false facade.

I want to clear one thing up. I have heard many of my Republican colleagues say that we should pass this bill, and we can just fill in the money later. Forgive me for being skeptical that they will actually follow through on that promise, because my friends on the other side of the aisle have been fighting for years to cut, not increase, the exact same programs they are now touting in this bill—what a sham.

With the rise of the tea party, the hard-right conservative factions in the House and Senate brought devastating proposed cuts to the health programs that combat the opioid problem, and my colleagues here who are not members of the tea party went along. Now that there is an opioid crisis, now that some are worried about reelection, oh, they are out there. Where were they last year and the year before? Where are they going to be this year in terms of actually getting some funding?

Last year, Republicans proposed billions of dollars in cuts to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill—the main funding source for substance abuse treatment. Without the bipartisan budget agreement, this would have cut \$9 billion. In fact, the Senate Appropriations Committee proposed cutting the Substance Abuse and Mental

Health Services Administration, or SAMHSA, by \$160 million before Democrats pushed to restore it. We didn't hear much of an outcry from the very same people who are out there saying they are doing things on opioids.

On the other side of the Capitol, the tea party Republicans have gone even further. In 2012, they proposed cutting SAMHSA by \$283 million. The latest PAUL RYAN budgets—the holy grail of Republican fiscal austerity—took a meat cleaver to this agency. He proposed cutting an estimated \$400 million from SAMHSA in 2013 and 2014.

The Republican record on actually funding these programs is, frankly, abysmal. When you hear treatment centers and when you hear law enforcement say that we don't have the resources to do what we need to do to go after the opioid crisis, ask yourself why, because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have fought increases in funding.

You can't have an additional counselor. I have held parents in my arms who said: My son or daughter didn't make it as they were waiting in line for treatment. There were not enough counselors, not enough slots. I have talked to law enforcement officials who say they want to do much more, but their hands are tied because they don't have enough cops, enough intelligence, enough follow-through on going after these evil drug dealers who are just despicable.

We want to say to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that what they probably would have done to us is to block this bill so we should have no accomplishments. That is what happened in 2013 and 2014. We are not going to do that. This has a few good things, but it is not close to enough.

The way the appropriations process has proceeded this session, I see no reason to believe how any of this is going to change. So far the majority has been utterly unable to pass bills that contain increases in funding. Why? Why wouldn't good people here who say they want to fight opioids and come home and talk about it do it? I will tell you why. Because the hard right has a stranglehold. They say no increase in funding for anything, except maybe Defense, and even a lot of the hard right people don't want that. Everyone goes along. They are afraid of the Koch brothers, who want to cut, cut, cut. They are afraid of the Heritage Foundation that wants to cut, cut, cut, and so they give speeches and even pass a bill that makes some small improvements, but they don't get the funding. It is not that they are malicious, but they don't have the courage and strength to stand up and do what is needed, and then they are hypocritical when they go back and say they are leading the fight to go after opioid addiction. That is the problem here. After years of opposing funding for mental health and substance abuse programs, no one should believe that Republicans are going to honor their promises

about CARA—yeah, down the road we will find some funding—until we see it.

Shortly the Senate will pass this bill. As soon as that happens, Republican Senators are going to run home to tout its passage as if they have single-handedly solved the opioid crisis in this country, but that will not be true. They will not mention that the bill has no funding and doesn't have the teeth it needs; they will not tell people that it doesn't include a dime for a new treatment bed, a dollar for a drug counselor's salary, or the needed increases in money for law enforcement. What it says is this: that colleagues on the other side of the aisle are more interested in showing voters they are doing something about opioids than actually doing something because they are constricted by a small, narrow, but powerful group of special interests in their party that say you can't vote for any increases in funding for anything, and it is a shame. This is an issue ripe for bipartisan compromise. It is an issue in which we can and must make real progress, but as it stands, this bill doesn't get the job done.

Every day 2,500 teenagers in America abuse prescription drugs for the first time. These are our kids, our neighbors, and our friends. We all know families that have had the anguish—and the joy that some have had as their sons and daughters have recovered. But everyone who knows people who have been fighting addiction—whether it is alcohol or prescription drug abuse or some other substance—knows that every day is a struggle and a fight. You are never sure that they will not go back. And then there are those who have lost kids. Sometimes their kids are just out on the streets, and their family doesn't know where they are, and some of them, of course, are gone. It is nothing we should be playing games with, and a small group of hard-right ideologues shouldn't be blocking change in America. We don't need a bill designed for campaign rhetoric. We need resources.

I strongly urge my Republican colleagues to schedule a vote on legislation that provides robust funding to address the opioid and heroin epidemic as soon as possible. Until we pass the increase in resources for law enforcement and treatment, both of which are so necessary, we cannot say that Congress has done what is necessary to solve and fight the opioid crisis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any time spent in quorum calls prior to 11 a.m. be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak in support of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. This bill represents an important step in tackling the growing crisis of prescription drug and heroin addiction in this country. I thank my colleagues, especially the original sponsors of this bill. Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator PORTMAN, Senator AYOTTE, and I have worked together on this legislation for a number of years.

Drug overdoses from opioids now claim more lives than car accidents every year. That is a pretty shocking statistic that I don't think most Americans would expect. The crisis is ripping apart families from all different backgrounds, and with deaths increasing nearly sixfold since the year 2000, it is a crisis on the rise. This deadly trend struck at the heart of Minnesota. Last year alone, 336 Minnesotans died after overdosing on opioids.

Since I started working on this bill, I have heard from people in communities across my State. In Montevideo, 12-year-olds were courted by pushers who said: Hey, kids. If you go in and check your parents' medicine cabinets—I'll give you a list—and bring us their prescription drugs, we will give you a can of beer. That happened in Montevideo, MN.

Shelly Elkington shared her tragic story. Her daughter, Casey Jo, was a champion swimmer and hoped to study nursing like her mom, but in 2008 she was diagnosed with Crohn's disease, and that is when she started taking opioids for pain relief. As we know, four out of five heroin users started out by misusing prescription pain killers, and in the end the very pills that were supposed to ease Casey Jo's pain didn't work. She became addicted and eventually turned to heroin and other drugs, and basically this addiction hijacked her life. She is no longer with us.

This is the story for far too many people. In one 7,000-person town in Minnesota, 3 young people died of opioid overdoses in just 6 months in 2013.

Our final bill includes a number of proven strategies to help States and local communities in the fight against addiction, and one of the most important provisions in it for me is looking at solutions for unused prescription drugs. Senator CORNYN and I passed a bill back in 2010 and finally got the rules out after advocating for them from the DEA, I believe for 4 years, and we are finally starting to see some pharmacies, such as Walgreens, voluntarily taking back unused prescription drugs. This bill helps to build on that work.

CARA also increases the availability of naloxone, which we know can be used in overdoses, and, of course, one of the most important things in this bill is a start at prescription drug monitoring. I emphasize that it is a start because I think a lot more needs to be

done with prescription drug monitoring. I would have liked to have done it in this bill, but now we need to move on and get something done.

Today, I will be introducing a bill with Senator KING and Senator MANCHIN to actually do something about prescription drug monitoring, and that is requiring individual States to put in place prescription drug monitoring programs and actually submit the data. I have learned—having Hazelden in my State—that some States have a program, but it just means doctors have to sign up. It doesn't actually mean that they actually record information or that they share it with other doctors. It doesn't even mean they share it between States. Our bill would require States that receive Federal funding to combat opioid abuse to ensure that their prescription drug monitoring complies with certain standards so that we can crack down on this addiction before it starts. It would require prescribers to consult with the PDMPs before they hand out prescriptions, require dispensers to report back within 24 hours of distribution, and would provide for the proactive notification of health care professionals when patterns indicative of opioid abuse are detected. For people who travel across State lines, it would also require States to share information.

Here is an example: There was a patient at Hazelden Betty Ford who had 108 prescriptions for painkillers filled by more than 85 different prescribers. Think about that: 85 different medical professionals had prescribed these drugs.

I met a rehab guy up in Moorhead who had a patient with a similar story, who had filled prescriptions from doctors in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. That is what is going on. If we don't require States to share information with other States, it is as if we don't really have a prescription drug program to begin with.

CARA is an important bill, but there are two things that we need to change in order to improve the work we are doing in Congress. No. 1 is the money for treatment that I know Senator SCHUMER just addressed, which is in Senator SHAHEN's bill, which would appropriate emergency funding and, second, not just say we are doing something about prescription drug monitoring but actually do something about prescription drug monitoring, and that is why I am introducing this bill today.

There is a lot of work ahead, but I want to conclude my remarks by acknowledging the major step we are taking by passing the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act and sending it to the President's desk to be signed into law.

I thank my colleagues for their support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I continue to be concerned by the determination of a number of people to move through the Senate the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal, the 5,554-page document, which the American people have clearly rejected and do not favor, even though powerful forces continue to push for it. It has been reported that both Presidential candidates oppose it; however, it does appear that Secretary Clinton's opposition is in doubt, and there was a troubling report yesterday.

Her top Asia policy adviser, who served as her Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia, Kurt Campbell, told an Australian news outlet that Clinton's opposition to TPP is not real. He said: "Every trade agreement goes through the deepest, darkest tunnel before it is ultimately passed." Her top adviser is saying to our Australian allies that it is going to pass, and that is contrary to what she has been telling the American people. In fact, I think it is fair to say that the worst-kept secret in Washington is that Hillary Clinton, if elected, intends—in some way and some fashion—to see that the TPP becomes law. She made 45 different statements during her time before this lawless agreement was being negotiated—up to the very end of Congressional debate over fast track—that she supported it. This statement by her top adviser is not only shocking but really confirms the fears that so many people have had—that her opposition to the TPP on the campaign trail is a result of the pressure of the voters and is not a real conversion.

After voicing her support for the 5,554-page agreement 45 times before running for President, and after refusing to take a position on it when asked about it for months during her campaign, she has since made statements to the American people that she opposes the agreement. Her senior policy adviser is overseas touting the benefits of TPP. Just as her email scandal problem proves, Mrs. Clinton tends to say one thing to the American people but another thing to her globalist friends.

The TPP creates a 12-country Pacific union, whereby each country gets a single vote. This will allow the union to legislate and change its own rules. It is described as a living agreement. They can even change their own rules. They can pass laws and regulations that make it very difficult—virtually impossible—for the American people to have control over it. It is going to be very difficult to contain this union where each country gets one vote. The United States gets one vote. The Sultan of Brunei gets one vote. Vietnam gets one vote. This makes no sense. We absolutely should not pass this massive agreement that erodes the economic strength of America, giving our competitors the same votes on important issues as we have.

Even the rosiest Trans-Pacific Partnership projections cited by the Obama

administration estimate that this agreement—their own estimate is it will slow the growth of manufacturing in the United States and cost us 120,000 manufacturing jobs over the next 15 years. But other studies show the United States could lose much more. A Tufts University study said we could lose 400,000 jobs. That is their analysis of it.

Secretary Clinton's adviser, Kurt Campbell, and other expansive trade advocates always believe in these free-trade agreements no matter what is in them. They seem to remain oblivious to the impacts that such a massive trade deal will have on the already-struggling economy and middle America. Mr. Campbell's statements are further confirmation that the Obama administration and Hillary Clinton have not given up on this deal. Indeed, President Obama continues to push for it openly and without apology. They fully intend to do everything they can to sneak the TPP through Congress, with perhaps some cosmetic changes to say they have fixed the problem, after the election—most likely during the lameduck session of the House or the Senate—when many Members are no longer accountable to the American people, or it could be even in the next Congress.

While talking with the newspaper *The Australian*, the former Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Campbell, also found time to denigrate and talk bad about the presumptive nominee of one of our national parties, Donald Trump. *The Australian* reported that the former Australian Foreign Minister has written that Mr. Campbell "will be Secretary of State if Mrs. Clinton becomes the President at the end of the year." Well, that is the first I have heard of that. We learned that maybe from *Australia*.

I believe this is another example of the kind of political duplicity that irritates, frustrates, and angers—legitimately—the American people. They have their leader saying one thing, promising one thing during the election season, all the while they are working to advance a different agenda entirely.

It is the same about fixing illegal immigration. They always promise it during the campaign, but when we get in the Senate and start actually voting on the things that would be necessary to create a lawful system of immigration that protects the national interests, it never seems to happen.

So it is pretty clear Hillary Clinton really supports the TPP. It was only an election-cycle diversion that caused her to back off of it, and she refuses to rule out its passage entirely. The media should demand that she clarify her position. Why will she not rule out passing it? Does her top adviser to Asia, meeting with Asian nations that would participate in this TPP—does he speak for her or not?

As quoted by *PolitiFact*, Mrs. Clinton said: "I waited until it had actu-

ally been negotiated"—she is explaining why she now opposes it when she supported it previously. She said: "I waited until it had actually been negotiated because I did want to give the benefit of the doubt to the (Obama) administration. Once I saw the outcome, I opposed it."

Well, that was not a very satisfactory answer to me at the time. I was very uneasy about that conversion to opposition, and now we have her top adviser to Asia saying something entirely different.

This is what the *Australian* newspaper said about him and this agreement. He says that—he did acknowledge globalization has sometimes been disruptive to politics, disruptive in countries like the United States. He is talking about disruptive for jobs and workers in the United States. I think he is certainly correct about that.

How did *PolitiFact* analyze Mrs. Clinton's statements? Here are some of the things they reported in their analysis. "Once I saw what the outcome was, I opposed it."

That is a pretty clear statement, it appears.

Speaking in *Australia* in 2012, however, she hailed the deal as "setting the gold standard."

She said: "This TPP sets the gold standard in trade agreements to open, free, transparent, fair trade, the kind of environment that has the rule of law and a level playing field."

It seems to me to be a total commitment to supporting the trade deal.

Remember, as Secretary of State, she is the chief diplomatic official for the United States. The Trade Representative does most of the negotiations, but the Secretary of State is involved in these negotiations. It involved the economic relationship of the United States with 11 other Pacific nations. So she knows what is going on in these negotiations and should be well aware of them. If she wasn't, she was not doing her job.

Hillary Clinton's support for the TPP goes on as she said that it would create "Better jobs with higher wages and safer working conditions, including for women, migrant workers and others too often in the past excluded from the formal economy will help build Asia's middle class and rebalance the global economy."

Well, I don't have any doubt that if this trade agreement is like the other trade agreements—and I believe it is—it will definitely help Asian trade competitors of ours. The question is, who is representing the American people? That is whom our legal, moral, and political responsibility is to—the American people. Is it going to be a better transaction for them or not? They don't think so, I don't think so, and a growing number of economists are beginning to understand why these trade deals I have so often supported in the past are not working effectively.

PolitiFact reported in October that she also described this trade deal over

time as “exciting, innovative, ambitious, groundbreaking, cutting-edge, high-quality, and high-standard.” That is the way she has described it over the years.

PolitiFact concludes with this: “Nonetheless, her comments at the time were so positive and so definitive, it becomes disingenuous to argue, as she’s doing now, that she didn’t endorse it before it was finalized.”

So that is where we are.

I will yield the floor if someone else arrives. That is the main point I wanted to make.

I would urge our colleagues to understand what is happening. There has been an analysis and a growing understanding within the developed nations of the world that their middle-class working people are being hammered by these trade agreements. Last year, it was reported that 55 percent of the people in Germany supported the transatlantic trade agreement, and this is a follow-on to the TPP, all part of the fast-track authority Congress gave to the Trade Representative of the United States. I opposed it, but Congress voted to approve it. He is negotiating right now with the Europeans on a matching-type treaty that will also be monumental involving the Atlantic trade deal.

Last year, 55 percent of the people in Germany supported this agreement. A recent poll in Germany showed now only 17 percent support it.

In recent weeks, clear messages have also been sent by the people of the United Kingdom, our British allies; they don’t like being placed in these large international trade organizations where the UK only gets one vote. If they get that in the European Union, I don’t know if they have a single vote—and they don’t believe it has been working in their interests. That was a factor in them voting to withdraw from the EU, even though the EU is pushing this trade deal—the TTIP—exceedingly hard.

What has been the impact on our trade deals in the past? In 2011, I supported the South Korea trade deal. It was an important deal, one of our biggest trade agreements, and they are allies. I believe in the South Koreans. They are good people. So we voted for it. Congress passed it. President Obama advocated for it and signed it. At the time, he declared that our exports to South Korea would increase \$10 billion a year and that would help create manufacturing jobs in the United States; that it would be a win-win: Korea would import more to us, but we would export more to Korea too, the trade deficit would not increase, and it would be a job creator in the United States. So Congress voted for it—a big vote for it.

Well, what has happened since 2011? Last year, our exports to Korea were not \$10 billion, not \$1 billion but \$30 million. Their exports to us from South Korea were \$15 billion. So what happened? The data, the projections were

not right. That is very damaging for America. Our trade deficit with South Korea more than doubled.

I would say to my colleagues somebody needs to be asking: What is happening to jobs in America? What is happening to wages in America? The situation is not good. Since 1999, wages in America have declined \$4,186, adjusted for inflation. That is the way to calculate it properly. Median family income is down over \$4,000 since 1999. Make no mistake, bad trade deals are a part of that. Another part of that is, when you bring in more workers than you have jobs for, you create a surplus of labor and wages go down, if there are any free-market people left on Wall Street, they understand that.

So we have had a double whammy, in addition to high regulations and stupid taxes that we impose on the economy. All of these things have created a situation in which we are not healthy economically. Wages are declining. Middle-class Americans are hurting. They have a right to ask: Who in Washington is looking out for my interests? That is the way I see it.

This trade agreement—5,500-some-odd pages—is bad. We do not need to pass it, and we absolutely do not need to go into another European Union-like trade agreement where the United States gets only one vote even though we have by far the dominant economy.

What do all of these countries want first and foremost? It is understandable. It is not evil. They want to sell in our market. They want to bring home American dollars. That is their goal.

When we enter into a trade agreement with somebody who wants to sell here, we should make sure that we do it in a way that protects American workers and makes sure that our trading partners open their markets to us so that we can export as much to them as we allow them to import to us.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I thank my colleagues for the vote we will take in a very short time on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act known as CARA. This legislation holds great promise to help families and communities combat the opioid epidemic that has truly been ravaging our Nation.

The epidemic is a public health crisis, causing death and destruction to families and communities, and this legislation is barely a symbolic step. The rhetoric on the floor today and throughout our consideration of this bill, unfortunately, is unmatched by real dollars. Until we commit resources, our words will be a glass half empty, and we must fill that glass with the resources necessary to truly make a difference, as I have seen from the roundtables I have held around the State of Connecticut where law enforcement, community activists, families whose loved ones have suffered from addiction, and addicts themselves

recovering from this disease—it is a disease, and we must recognize it as a disease that can be treated if we commit the resources.

I thank Senator COATS for joining me in authoring the Expanding Access to Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs Act, which is among the measures included in this bill. This provision would allow nurse practitioners and physician assistants to access State prescription drug monitoring programs and view the patient’s prescription opioid history to determine if a patient has a history of addiction.

Although nurse practitioners and physician assistants write over 30 million opioid prescriptions every year, including in 2013, few States allow them to consult and submit prescribing data to these important State databases. Allowing them to access more information about a patient’s history enables them to help address potential addiction before it becomes a serious problem.

Critically, we must recognize the key role nurse practitioners and physician assistants can play in curbing prescription drug abuse and diversion. That is why this provision allowing those nurse practitioners and physician assistants to access State prescription drug monitoring programs is so important.

I thank my colleague Senator BALDWIN for her tireless effort in advancing the Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act to address overprescribing and accountability at the VA. Her leadership on behalf of Jason’s family and their courage and strength, particularly his mother Linda, widow Heather, and daughter Anaya, were impressive and instrumental in incorporating this measure.

The provisions from Senator BALDWIN’s legislation that have been included in CARA will require the VA to expand the use of opioid safety initiatives within all VA facilities—a profoundly important step because it will enable the VA to better facilitate use of State prescription drug monitoring programs and ensure that all VA facilities provide naloxone to at-risk veterans without a copay. That is a profoundly significant step.

I hope monitoring and tracking programs will be further improved so that State boundaries can be more easily overcome in terms of information flow, and the effectiveness can include not only the VA but our civilian programs.

Additionally, improvements to the VA Patient Advocacy Program will truly help the VA better serve our veterans.

These provisions are also included in the Veterans First Act. I am hopeful that this body will move forward on the Veterans First Act.

I appreciate the bipartisan work of my colleagues in addressing the opioid crisis. I am pleased to support this bill but again emphasize that it is a short-term solution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES WALLNER

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, Capitol Hill is a famously transient place. Every 2 years, the membership of the House of Representatives changes, the membership of the Senate changes, and in the interim, the coming and going of congressional staffers is virtually constant. But when you take a step back and look through the wide lens of history, you can see certain pillars of permanence, certain exceptional individuals who stand out from and rise above the fleeting crowd. These are the institutional giants of Congress, the men and women whose extraordinary talents and devotion to the Constitution have shaped the character and the course of government and whose legacies continue to influence Congress long after the individuals behind them have gone.

For the past 5½ years, I have had the pleasure of working with and learning from one such individual, a true master of the Senate, James Wallner.

Friday will be James's last day as executive director of the Senate steering committee—although the optimist in me hopes that he will be back in the Senate someday. Starting next week, he will join the Heritage Foundation as the group vice president of research, where he will oversee all of the think tank's research papers, projects, and initiatives. For this, James is eminently qualified. James has been studying politics in the classroom and in real life on Capitol Hill throughout his entire adult life. In all his spare time, in between advising Senators and raising his two children, Graham and Quinn, with his wife Kimberly, James has been busy becoming a scholar, earning two master's degrees and a doctoral degree in politics, and an accomplished author, having published one book, with another forthcoming.

Aside from what must be the best time-management skills in the world, coupled with the fact that the man probably never sleeps, this is what you first notice about James: just how freakishly smart he is.

I will never forget the first time I met James, which was back in 2011, not too long after I had been sworn in to office as a Senator. As a brandnew Senator with a brandnew staff, one of my top priorities was to find someone who could help mentor and guide me and my staff—someone outside of my staff. My staff included a lot of people who had never worked in Washington before, so we needed someone on the outside of our staff to help teach us how the Senate really works and how Congress really works.

I asked around for suggestions, and one name kept coming up: James Wallner. If you need someone to give a

crash course or an extended, semester-length course or a course lasting 5½ years on Senate procedure, politics, and policy, James Wallner is the man.

This was some of the best advice I had ever received—to consult James Wallner on these and other issues. The instruction and guidance James provided to me and my staff far exceeded expectations. James's knowledge of the Senate is encyclopedic. Working with him is like having your own personal Parliamentarian by your side, always ready and eager to give comprehensive answers to virtually every question that might come up, even those dealing with the most arcane procedural mechanics within the Senate.

Most people in Washington operate on the premise that connections are what you need to succeed in politics. Some might even assume that they are all you need to succeed in politics. James, although known and esteemed by many, has flipped this conventional wisdom on its head. For him, it is not who he knows but what he knows that has made him an invaluable resource for so many Members in Congress and so many staffers on both sides of the Capital over the years.

While his formidable intellect has set him apart over the 10 years in the Senate, the qualities I always admired most in James are his deep and abiding love for this country, for its history, its people, and its institutions, and his uncompromising commitment to the self-evident truths upon which it was founded and the truths built into our governing document, the U.S. Constitution.

One of my favorite examples of this is exemplified by James's annual tradition of reading, start to finish, the official and complete notes from the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Of course, for James, it is not enough to simply read and re-read this voluminous text every year; he makes sure to do it between May 25 and September 17 so that he can read each day's notes on the very day or the very anniversary of the very day on which they were originally recorded.

James brought the same passion and appreciation for our constitutional heritage to his work as the executive director of the Senate steering committee, a position which he has held since 2012. The purpose and mission of the steering committee is to encourage innovative thinking and bold action within the Senate's Republican conference. This is no easy task, of course. In a town that is not exactly known for innovation or boldness, many may see this as a mission impossible, but James saw it as a moral imperative because he understands that many of our government's and our country's most urgent problems today are caused by an unnatural timidity and sclerosis within the legislative branch.

The job may be difficult, but James carried it out with an admirable combination of tenacity, patience, courage, and grace, and always with an unre-

lenting devotion to recovering America's founding principles and thereby putting the Congress back to work for the American people.

As James knows better than most, placing principle over party and elevating the interests of the American people over the interests of political elites is unlikely to win a popularity contest in Washington, but it will earn you the respect of your colleagues and anyone happening to be watching.

Few on Capitol Hill respect James more than two of his former bosses, Senator PAT TOOMEY and Senator JEFF SESSIONS. This is what each of them had to say about James on the occasion of his departure from the Senate.

Senator TOOMEY said:

James Wallner not only understands a wide range of policy issues, but he is a master of the congressional rules and procedures needed to turn conservative philosophies into action. He is an exceptionally smart strategist and is willing to work hard to advance the ideas needed to restore an American government that is limited in scope, efficient with taxpayers' money, and accountable to the voters.

Senator SESSIONS said:

It has been an honor to work with James in the Senate. I am proud to say that James began his Senate career in my office as a Legislative Assistant and later became my Legislative Director. In these roles, James demonstrated a mastery of congressional procedure and policy. He has supported not only me, but the entire party in developing and working to implement conservative, pro-growth policies that help place our nation on a more sustainable path. The Heritage Foundation is fortunate to have hired a man of such skill and I am confident that he will serve them well. James is without a doubt one of the most talented and dedicated staffers I have ever worked with or known in the Senate.

For 10 years, James Wallner has been an exceptionally articulate, passionate, knowledgeable, and steadfast champion of the very things that make the Senate great and that make the Senate unique—especially open, robust debate and deliberation. The Senate is better because of him.

He will be missed. But with so many challenges looming over the horizon and with so much work yet ahead of us to be completed, something tells me this will not be the last time the Senate hears from James Wallner.

Thank you, Mr. President.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Chuck Grassley, John Cornyn,

Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Kelly Ayotte, John McCain, Rob Portman, John Barrasso, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, John Thune, Orrin G. Hatch.

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 the conference report to accompany S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin abuse, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 90, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Ernst	Mikulski
Ayotte	Feinstein	Moran
Baldwin	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Murphy
Bennet	Franken	Murray
Blumenthal	Gardner	Nelson
Blunt	Gillibrand	Paul
Booker	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Peters
Boxer	Hatch	Portman
Brown	Heinrich	Reed
Burr	Heitkamp	Reid
Cantwell	Heller	Risch
Capito	Hirono	Rubio
Cardin	Hoeven	Sanders
Carper	Isakson	Schatz
Casey	Johnson	Schumer
Cassidy	Kaine	Scott
Coats	King	Shaheen
Collins	Kirk	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Corker	Lankford	Tester
Cornyn	Leahy	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	Markey	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	McConnell	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wyden

NAYS—2

Lee Sasse

NOT VOTING—8

Cochran	Rounds	Vitter
Inhofe	Sessions	Wicker
Roberts	Shelby	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 2.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays be-

fore the Senate the House message to accompany H.R. 636, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 636) entitled "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes," with House amendments to Senate amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendments to H.R. 636.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 1:45 p.m. will be equally divided between the leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, before I give my speech, I ask unanimous consent for Senator PORTMAN to have 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and, in less than a minute, I want to acknowledge something historic that just happened on this floor—a 90-to-2 vote for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. This is the Senate agreeing with the House to do something important to address this epidemic of heroin and prescription drug abuse, and I congratulate my colleague SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, my coauthor, and encourage all my colleagues to now get this signed as soon as possible so we can get it out to our communities to help.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

REFORMING THE BUDGET PROCESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to discuss America's broken budget process and the Senate Budget Committee's continuing effort to provide solutions to place our Nation's budget on a better, sustainable path.

Last year, on May 5, the Senate passed its first balanced 10-year budget since 2001. This was a big deal. It was thoroughly considered and amended to the tune of 71 rollcall votes, and 146 amendments adopted overall, and it provided an enforceable plan to get the Nation's exploding debt under control.

On May 22, just 17 days later, we enacted legislation that violated the budget. Congress didn't even abide by the budget for a whole month. This trend has continued throughout the 114th Congress. Since passing its fiscal year 2016 budget plan, Congress has been unable to achieve any reduction in overspending called for in the balanced budget. Instead, Congress enacted legislation increasing spending by nearly \$150 billion and reducing revenue by \$478 billion over the 10-year window. Much of these violations were enacted as part of the end-of-the-year omnibus spending bill, which was draft-

ed behind closed doors and passed under threat of government shutdown, completely outside of regular order.

The truth is, America's budget process is broken, and it is preventing Congress from tackling the pressing fiscal challenges facing our country. The current budget process is designed only to spend and fails hard-working taxpayers. Each year, nearly \$3 trillion is spent by Washington without any meaningful congressional review or consideration. What America really needs is a budget process built to save.

The last time Congress reformed the budget process was in 1974. Times have changed, and the 40-year-old process has only grown more dysfunctional and antiquated. Until 1998, Congress had never failed to pass a budget, but in the last 15 years, Congress failed to pass a budget resolution more than half the time. Today, budgets from Congress and the President are increasingly tossed aside, leaving the country with no long-term fiscal plan.

Our appropriations process is broken. Spending bills are nearly always late, creating crippling uncertainty for agencies, businesses, and the American people. We have completed all appropriations bills on time in only 4 of the last 45 years. In 15 of those years, we did not pass one appropriations bill on time. Instead of well-considered funding decisions, the government operates on short-term spending bills or continuing resolutions. We have had to use 173 short-term spending bills since 1977, and that is just 3 years after the Budget Act was passed.

That is just the portion of the budget Congress has control over. Today, a growing portion of our budget is devoted to entitlements and other automatic spending. When Congress last reformed the budget process in 1974, this type of spending constituted only one-third of what was spent and two-thirds of the spending provided annually.

This chart points that out: 1966, 33 percent on automatic pilot, 67 percent, annual review. Now, 70 percent automatic spending, 30 percent under annual review. And this is growing automatically. These don't have guaranteed revenue sources. Whenever the revenue source doesn't meet up with what we have already said would automatically be paid, it cuts into this 30 percent that we get for annual review—automatically—and reduces the amount we get to actually make decisions on.

I have talked about what could happen if the interest rates go up—\$19 trillion in debt. So \$20 trillion at a 1-percent interest rate would cost us \$200 billion a year. The norm, 5 percent, would cost us 1,000 billion, or \$1 trillion, and we only get to make decisions—this part of it—on \$1,070 billion. So how would we fund everything the government does on \$70 billion?

This crisis is coming. In 2016, 70 percent of Federal spending is provided automatically, essentially on autopay year after year without congressional review or approval. In 15 years, this

runaway spending and interest will consume all of the taxes and revenues the Federal Government collects crowding out the functions we normally associate with good government.

What would those be? Some really important ones would be national defense and border security, maybe transportation, maybe education.

This mandatory spending operates with no connection between funding decisions and program performance. Given that this spending often continues in perpetuity, the least we can do is ensure that it is spent effectively.

I want to repeat that part. The mandatory spending operates with no connection between funding decisions and program performance. There are a whole bunch of programs out here in the 70 percent that we never have to look at because they are going to get their money anyway. Nobody lobbies us on it because they get their money, anyway. So we don't have any program performance. How many of those do we suppose are not doing what they were originally intended to do? I am willing to bet a lot of them. In fact, I have looked at them and know it is a lot of them.

The good news is there are bipartisan steps Congress can take now to fix America's broken budget process. The Senate Budget Committee has held a series of hearings and meetings to discuss bipartisan solutions that would, No. 1, improve the way Congress considers budget legislation, No. 2, update the antiquated accounting rules that would affect the information Congress uses to make tax and spending decisions, and, No. 3, set the country's finances on a sustainable path by establishing enforceable long-term fiscal targets.

Congress can begin to regain control of the Nation's finances by reforming the procedures it uses to consider budget legislation. Based on conversations with Democratic and Republican members of my committee, I am pursuing the following reforms with the understanding that they will receive bipartisan support:

First, the Senate's rules governing consideration of budget resolutions are overly burdensome and discourage passage of this important planning document. We can fix this by reforming what we call the vote-arama, the disgraceful ritual that has turned into a string of meaningless gotcha votes. The Senate should bring order to this chaotic process by establishing filing deadlines and limits on the number of amendments that can be offered.

Second, the Senate should be required to devote floor time to consideration of annual appropriations measures—the annual spending measures. In Wyoming, the State legislature encourages full consideration of their spending bills by holding a budget session—that is, a session of the regular legislature—and it requires a two-thirds vote to consider any nonbudget legislation. We should have similar rules in the

Senate to make sure we get our work done.

Third, budget points of order should be meaningful. Today, they are routinely ignored or waived by Members of this body. The Senate should tie the waiver vote threshold to the size of the budget violation. De minimis violations—that would be under half a million dollars, probably—should be automatically waived, while large violations should be subject to up to a two-thirds vote threshold. It has to be a little more difficult for us to violate what we set out to do.

Fourth, Congress needs to rethink the way it allocates Federal resources. Our fragmented budget process makes it nearly impossible to know how much of the government's resources are devoted to a particular policy goal. There is a different budget for the Budget Committee, a different one for the spending committees which are the appropriators, and a different one for the White House. I think it is intentional, so that we can't follow what it is. Our fragmented budget process makes it impossible to know how much of the government's resources are devoted to a particular policy goal. We should establish subcommittees within the Budget Committee to review entire portfolios of government spending and tax policy to ensure the programs and funding are actually accomplishing certain policy objectives. This would help identify both effective and ineffective programs, reducing waste, and focusing on results.

We should also consider moving to a 2-year funding cycle. Funding uncertainty creates wasteful spending, disrupts government operations and planning, and reduces productive investment and hiring in the private sector. A biennial process would lock in 2 years of spending in law, providing Federal agencies, businesses, and the American people with certainty and predictability. That is why this commonsense solution has been supported by Presidents, legislators, and good-governance think tanks from both parties for decades.

Once the Senate passes legislation to improve our internal budget procedures, we should move on to the more fundamental problems of the current budget process; that is, the antiquated accounting rules and our growing debt burden. The private sector applies modern advances in economics, accounting, and finance to accurately reflect a business's financial condition and the potential impact of new policies, but the Federal Government's budget rules haven't undergone comprehensive reviews since 1967. That was 50 years ago. This issue may seem dry and boring, but as an accountant, I can tell you that it is extremely important and exciting. Antiquated accounting techniques mislead Congress and the public, and they misstate the true cost of government activities. Updating these budget rules will provide Congress with the honest, accurate information nec-

essary to allocate taxpayer dollars effectively and efficiently.

Finally, Congress should get serious about addressing America's long-term debt crisis, which today totals more than \$19 trillion and is expected to grow over \$29 trillion by 2026—and that is just based on this 70 percent on automatic pilot. We need long-term, enforceable fiscal targets with guideposts along the way that ensure revenues and spending are moving in the right direction.

Fiscal targets alone will not fix the Federal budget. Congress will need to enact substantial policy reforms if it wants to get our Nation's debt under control. Former Budget Chairmen Judd Gregg and Kent Conrad—one Republican, one Democrat—recommended establishing a bipartisan commission to submit a legislative proposal that would achieve long-term revenue, spending, and debt targets. Congress would then be required to consider and vote on the commission's recommendations without amendment. This is a creative, bipartisan approach to addressing politically difficult decisions that must be made to ensure this country's future prosperity.

The Budget Committee has been working diligently on these reforms and stands ready to offer bipartisan legislation should the Senate choose to fix our broken budget process. The time to act is now. We are currently spending over \$230 billion in interest on our debt every year, even with historically low interest rates that I talked about. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that every one percentage point our interest rates rise will increase America's overspending by \$1.6 trillion over the next 10 years, or about \$160 billion a year. That is a 1-percent rise in the interest rate—\$230 billion—up another \$160 billion, up another \$160 billion. Interest on the debt will soon put America out of the business of protecting its citizens from foreign threats, educating our youth, and building national infrastructure like highways and roads.

These bipartisan reforms wouldn't solve all of our budget problems, but they are a promising first step toward unsticking the budget gridlock that has gripped Washington in recent years. This would begin to put our Nation on not just another path but a better path.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following article, which appears in the Washington Times today, be printed in the RECORD: "Government not close to paying for promises, CBO says." The subtitle is "Tax increases, cuts needed to return to normal debt load," by Stephen Dinan.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, July 13, 2016]
GOVERNMENT NOT CLOSE TO PAYING FOR PROMISES, CBO SAYS: TAX INCREASES, CUTS NEEDED TO RETURN TO NORMAL DEBT LOAD
 (By Stephen Dinan)

The economy simply cannot grow fast enough to cover the federal government's generous promises to Americans, the Congressional Budget Office said Tuesday, laying out grim options of massive tax increases or withering cuts to spending that loom ahead.

After a few years of post-recession relief, deficits are roaring back, the CBO said, sounding a call to action for a Congress and White House that have instead been arguing over how much to increase spending.

But with health care costs rising, and an aging population already promised very generous Social Security and Medicare benefits, the government cannot come close to paying for its current promises, the CBO said.

"Revenues are projected to increase, but much more slowly than spending, leading to larger budget deficits and rising debt," the analysts said in their long-term budget outlook.

The picture is substantially worse than just a year ago, when the CBO said debt held by the public would reach 107 percent of gross domestic product by 2040. Now, the CBO says, that figure will be 122 percent—a 15-point turn for the worse.

Analysts said Congress keeps cutting taxes and boosting spending, at a time when the budget hole calls for the exact opposite approach.

To get back to normal—which means a debt rate of about 40 percent of the economy—the government would have to cut \$560 billion out of next year's budget, and growing every year thereafter. Even to maintain the current level of already excessive debt, which is 75 percent of the economy, would require cuts of \$330 billion in 2017.

"The longer lawmakers waited to act, the larger the necessary policy changes would become," the CBO said.

Budget watchdog groups demanded Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, the presumptive presidential nominees for Democrats and the GOP, begin to talk about the massive fiscal problems looming ahead.

"The presidential candidates should step up and address our dangerous long-term debt trajectory with constructive solutions and real leadership, not continuing to duck these challenges as they have so far," said Maya MacGuineas, head of Fix the Debt.

Robert L. Bixby, executive director of the Concord Coalition, said the presidential hopefuls need to take the issue to voters so the public gets invested in the debate, and so the elections produce a mandate for the kinds of solutions needed to fix things.

The deficit was a dominant issue in 2010, as President Obama's health law, the Wall Street bailout and the stimulus package were all making a major dent in the government's finances. Deficits soared beyond the \$1 trillion mark for the first time in history.

The deficit has dropped dramatically over the last few years as spending limits, imposed by Congress, have kicked in, and as some of the post-recession tax breaks have expired.

But the CBO said things are about to get worse.

Revenue will remain low—at between 18 and 19 percent of GDP, which is about the average of the last 40 years. But spending will explode, rising from 21 percent today to more than 27 percent by 2040.

That means that 30 years from now, the government will regularly run deficits totaling \$5 trillion a year—more than the size of the entire federal budget right now.

Social Security, which eats up 4.9 percent of GDP today, will average 6.3 percent in 25 years. Medicare, which stands at 3.8 percent today, will balloon to 6.6 percent surpassing Social Security to become the biggest entitlement program.

Meanwhile discretionary spending—the nuts and bolts government operations such as education, defense and homeland security—will drop to just 5.2 percent of GDP.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, there is another article that the Washington Times did called "Budget chairman to propose bipartisan overhaul of congressional budget process." It has bipartisan quotes from members of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, July 12, 2016]
BUDGET CHAIRMAN TO PROPOSE BIPARTISAN OVERHAUL OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS

(By Tom Howell, Jr.)

Senate Budget Committee Chairman Mike Enzi on Wednesday will propose the first bipartisan overhaul of Congress' budget process in four decades, saying lawmakers should outline two years of spending at a time and then stick to their plans.

The Wyoming Republican hopes to put an end to the last-minute deadline showdowns that have plagued Capitol Hill over the last six years by forcing the Senate to debate spending bills soon after the annual budget is finished.

"Instead of a functioning appropriations process, Congress has resorted to massive omnibus appropriations bills and continuing resolutions that carry over spending from the previous year," he says in a summary of his plan obtained by The Washington Times.

He said it needs to be easier to write the budget and harder to break it once it's finished. And he said Congress should be forced to spend more time working on the spending bills to carry out the budget, as a way of making the document matter.

Under current rules, Congress is supposed to complete a budget by April 15 each year, and the spending committees then use that broad blueprint to write 12 appropriations bills doling out the money by Sept. 30.

In reality, Congress never meets either deadline.

Lawmakers instead regularly pass short-term stopgap bills to keep the government open, limping along until they can agree on massive year-end spending packages that please neither side. Over the last 40 years, Congress approved some 173 stopgap bills.

Other times Congress has failed altogether, sending the government into partial shutdowns.

Mr. Enzi believes changing the process can produce better results, and will formally outline his ideas in a speech early Wednesday on the Senate floor.

In his outline, he says the government is already operating on two-year budgets after massive debt agreements in 2011, 2013 and 2015. But he'd make it even easier to write a budget by limiting the number of amendments that can be considered on the Senate floor.

It's also relatively easy to break the budget caps, with a 60-vote threshold. Mr. Enzi says small breaches should be easy, but the bigger the spending, the tougher it should be.

Really big budget breaches should require a two-thirds vote, he says—the equivalent of overturning a presidential veto.

Also, Mr. Enzi says the Senate should focus on the regular appropriations bills from the moment the budget resolution is adopted until Congress breaks for its August recess.

Any attempt to consider a non-appropriations measure during that period would require a two-thirds vote in the Senate.

Mr. Enzi also wants a new budget commission to update government accounting practices.

For instance, the commission could explore whether "dynamic scoring," in which the economic impact of federal policies is taken into account by congressional scorekeepers, should be used to enforce budget agreements.

Committee aides expect Democrats to support rules that would limit the number of floor amendments allowed to budgets, though other aspects of the plan might be a tougher sell, for instance Democrats have balked at Republican demands to use dynamic scoring to count the economic ripple effect of tax cuts.

Sen. Angus King, Maine independent who caucuses with Democrats, said he's already on board with Mr. Enzi's plan to budget for two years instead of just one.

"It gives you more time for oversight, and it's ridiculous to do a one-year budget on an enterprise this big," he said.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President at 1:45 p.m. today, we are going to vote on the FAA bill. It is coming back, in essence, as a conference report, although it was negotiated directly with the House. So we will take up the House message.

I thank Senator THUNE, the chairman of the committee, because the two of us, of course, get along, and we have worked together to achieve an agreement with our counterparts in the House. So I thank Senator THUNE. There were parts of this bill that he basically said for me to work them out with the Republican chairman in the House, and the work product is the proof in the pudding that we are going to take up today.

This is a little more than a 14-month extension, but don't let that fool you because it is going to put into permanent law bolstering security at our airports in order to help better protect us. Of course, in these times, the safety of our traveling public is a top priority. In fact, it contains some of the most significant aviation security reforms that Congress has ever considered, and we have considered, as the Presiding Officer can remember, a lot since September 11, 2001. It also contains a number of consumer protection and drone safety provisions. So let me just enumerate a couple of those.

To address the insider threat posed by terrorists, we increase the vetting requirements and random physical screenings of airport employees. What we found was, especially with the Atlanta airport situation 2 years ago, that they were not really checking their airport employees. There was a gunrunning scheme over a 3-month period in which an Atlanta airport employee would bring in guns. He wasn't

checked, he wasn't screened, and they didn't know what was in his backpack. Then he would go into the sterile TSA area where passengers are, into the men's room, and he would trade his backpack to a passenger that had already come through TSA screening. For 3 months they carried on this scheme of running guns from Atlanta to New York. Thank goodness, they weren't terrorists. They were criminals. But we can imagine that something like 150 guns were transported over that 3-month period. Well, that is what we addressed in this FAA bill. We have increased the screening required at the airports, even though that is their responsibility. The most effective thing for TSA in screening anybody or baggage is the nose of a dog. We have doubled VIPR dog teams, and that is a substantive change.

What about the international flights? We are always concerned about the point of last departure in an international designation coming into the United States. Have they been sufficiently checked, since we in effect are relying on the host government of that airport for a U.S.-inbound flight? This will authorize TSA to donate unneeded security equipment to foreign airports with service to the United States. We are calling for increased cooperation between us and partner nations on routes flown by Americans. We are now in this bill requiring a new assessment of foreign cargo security programs.

We also are setting up new screening systems and security checkpoint configurations to try to expedite passengers getting through. But at the same time, recognizing what happened in the terrorist attacks in Belgium and Istanbul makes it clear that we have to reduce the vulnerability of all those passengers amassing as a soft target before they ever go through the TSA checkpoint. That is what they did in Istanbul and in Belgium. So we put stuff to address that in this bill.

Now, as to cyber security, we have heard a lot about it. Certainly, the cyber security risk for the FAA is a definite one, and we have done stuff in this bill to reduce the cyber security risk to the national airspace system and civil aviation. That includes reducing the vulnerability of the in-flight entertainment systems. We have all seen that video where someone with a laptop can take over a car through the in-car entertainment systems. We are concerned about that with regard to airlines, airplanes as well. This legislation supports the FAA efforts to develop a threat model to strengthen against that cyber security threat.

What about consumers? This is substantive law that will last far beyond the extension of this bill that extends the FAA authorization through September 30 of next year. Don't you get irritated when you pay a baggage fee? Say you pay 50 bucks for an extra bag or a heavy bag and all of a sudden it is lost or significantly delayed? In this bill, those baggage fees are going to be returned.

We are also going to require the airlines to have policies that are family-friendly. What about the child who desperately needs to sit next to a parent? Save for the goodness of the passengers—and the passengers usually respond because they are good people and realize that a child ought to sit close to a parent. We have enshrined that in this bill, and that will become a permanent law.

For air travel with people with disabilities, we call for a review of the training and practices by airports and airlines and require the Department of Transportation to accelerate the rule-making.

Finally, I want to talk about the potential—and it is an accident waiting to happen—of an unmanned aerial vehicle—in other words, a drone—colliding with an airliner. We had a report a few months ago about an inbound American Airlines flight into Miami. They sighted a drone off the left wing. It is absolutely essential that we keep drones out of the airspace for takeoffs and landings in a busy airfield, so we have set up in the legislation a pilot program to develop and test technologies to intercept that drone or to shut it down when it is near an airport in order that we don't have what we know would be a catastrophic crash. It requires the FAA to work with NASA to test and develop a drone traffic management system.

I thank all of our Senate colleagues. I thank the ranking member and the chairman in the House, as we negotiated these provisions in this bill. That is what we are going to vote on at 1:45 p.m. I commend the FAA bill, and I hope the Senate considers it favorably.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Republican whip.

(The remarks of Mr. CORNYN pertaining to the introduction of S. 3184 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as we take up extension of the FAA reauthorization this week, I want to voice my frustration that an extension of the section 48 energy investment tax credit was not included. More importantly, I want to make clear my continued commitment to securing the credit's extension before the end of the year. This is an issue of immediate urgency.

The tax package agreed to at the end of last year extended the section 48 energy investment tax credit for 5 years, beginning on January 1, 2017, phased down to 26 percent in 2020 and 22 percent in 2021. However, through a drafting error, some technologies in section 48 were left out of that long-term extension. As a result, those technologies—including fuel cells, geothermal, hydropower, and biomass, among others—are set to expire at the end of this year.

Picking winners and losers was not our intention. The majority leader

agreed with that sentiment and made a commitment to address the discrepancy early this year. Unfortunately, we have yet to place it on a moving legislative vehicle. The lack of certainty for these technologies is creating market distortions that will drive capital out of these technologies and toward those with longer-term incentives.

I think it is important that we support an all-of-the-above energy strategy and ensuring new clean energy technologies have a seat at the table is a key component. Therefore, although I had hoped to see us put the section 48 fix on the FAA extension, I remain committed to securing this change before the end of the year. This is a non-controversial, already-agreed to modification and it should be processed expeditiously.

(At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I wish to support the FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016. The FAA extension provides the aviation community with necessary stability over the next year and sets into motion important reforms to improve safety and security for air travelers. This legislation includes provisions that support the general aviation community, as well as job creators in Oklahoma. First, this bill includes third class medical reform, the foundation to my Pilot's Bill of Rights 2, which will cut burdensome red tape and encourage pilots to disclose and treat medical conditions that could impact their ability to fly. It also includes a provision allowing critical infrastructure operators to use drones to support their needs for meeting existing regulations or in response to natural disasters. This provision will make way for innovative technology to be used with large-scale infrastructure, such as bridges or pipelines, so that businesses can safely and efficiently provide services to their consumers.

I am particularly pleased to note that this bill includes the third class medical reforms from my bipartisan Pilot's Bill of Rights 2, which has passed the Senate three times since last December. This legislation is strongly supported by the entire general aviation community, a number of pilot unions, including the Allied Pilots Association representing the pilots of American Airlines, the Southwest Airlines Pilots' Association, and the NetJets Association of Shared Aircraft Pilots, as well as the National Association of State Aviation Officials. In particular, I want to highlight the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, AOPA, and the Experimental Aircraft Association, EAA, for their leadership and support from the beginning and all their work to educate my colleagues in Congress on issues that affect pilots. I am very grateful for the strong and consistent voice of AOPA and EAA members who have shared why third class medical reform is necessary.

FAA's current medical certification process is bureaucratic, burdensome, and discourages pilots from disclosing and treating medical conditions that could impact their ability to fly. This legislation reforms the medical certification process for general aviation pilots in a way that will increase pilots' knowledge of risk while demanding treatment of identified conditions. The reforms expand the existing exemption for light sport pilots to include more qualified, trained pilots, as long as they complete three requirements. First, pilots must complete an online medical education course; second, pilots must maintain verification that they have been to a doctor at least once every 4 years and certify that they are receiving the care they need as directed by their physician to treat any medical condition that warrants treatment; and third, pilots must complete one comprehensive medical review by the FAA.

The FAA extension legislation also includes a provision that would allow critical infrastructure owners and operators to use unmanned aircraft systems to comply with mandated regulations and to perform emergency response and preparation activities.

This amendment would apply to energy infrastructure, such as oil and gas and renewable electric energy, it would apply to power utilities and telecommunications networks, and it would apply to roads and bridges and water supply system operators. Today critical infrastructure owners and operators are required to comply with significant requirements to monitor facilities and assets, which can stretch thousands of miles, and traverse rural and hard to access areas. Existing Federal safety regulations require periodic patrolling of the rights of way of critical infrastructure such as pipelines or transmission lines to check for encroachment, unauthorized excavation, evidence of leaks, or any other conditions that might jeopardize the safety of the pipeline or transmission line. Currently, Federal regulations allow periodic patrols to be conducted on foot, in vehicles, or with manned aircraft.

This language would ensure that critical infrastructure owners and operators, sponsors or associations who sponsor critical infrastructure, or their agents are able to apply to the Federal Aviation Administration to use unmanned aircraft as well.

This is of particular importance because unmanned aircraft can be quickly deployed to assess dangerous situations as part of a coordinated response to provide immediate feedback and situational awareness and direct resources to locations of highest danger. The use of unmanned aircraft would provide consistent and long-term on-scene information gathering capability in spite of weather or other incident dangers harmful to responding personnel, reduce the threat to response personnel in emergency situations.

This amendment is supported by a wide array of stakeholders including the Small UAV Coalition, the National Rural Electric Cooperatives, the American Public Power Association, Edison Electric Institute, CTIA—the Wireless Association, the American Gas Association, the American Public Gas Association, the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America, the American Petroleum Institute, the Association of Oil Pipelines, the American Fuels and Petrochemical Manufacturers, 3D Robotics, and the American Wind Energy Association. Congress should provide direction to FAA to set up a process for critical infrastructure operators to be able to safely operate unmanned aerial vehicles where there is clear and articulable need, and the provision included in this bill accomplishes that goal.

I strongly support this legislation, and I look forward to ensuring the swift implementation of these provisions by the Federal Aviation Administration in the coming months.●

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on another matter, earlier today this Chamber voted to move the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act conference report forward. This legislation has been the work of bipartisanship from the beginning, and it sailed through the Senate earlier this year.

Now, this bicameral agreement authorizes even more resources to combat the epidemic of heroin and prescription painkiller abuse that is tearing families apart across the country. Over the last few years, we have heard the stories and we have seen a dangerous trend of heroin and prescription drug abuse. In my State alone, it is estimated that these deaths have increased by as much as 80 percent in recent years. There is no doubt this is a serious issue. This is not just a bipartisan issue; this is a nonpartisan issue. Now is our chance to get something done.

I am grateful for the hard work and the leadership of the junior Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, who has shepherded this bill from the beginning to where we are today, along with Senator AYOTTE from New Hampshire, Senator BLUNT from Missouri, and Chairman GRASSLEY of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I want to thank all of them for their role in getting this bill across the finish line. Now we need to complete our work and pass it so we can get it to the President's desk.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Of course, there is a lot more we should be doing for the American people this week, but unfortunately, instead of advancing bills that would help prevent birth defects from the Zika virus and divert a public health crisis, our colleagues want to talk about climate change. I understand many of them feel this is a serious matter and a priority, but what they have been basically doing is beating up on a group of nonprofits and private citizens no one outside the beltway has

even heard of, and for what? For having the temerity to exercise their rights under the Constitution, their rights to free speech and free expression. Heaven forbid someone should utter words that somebody across the aisle might disagree with. The answer, as we know, to speech you disagree with is more speech, not less speech. It should not be used to try to squash, intimidate, coerce the people you disagree with. That is not the America I know, and that is not what the Constitution provides for.

I hope our colleagues will get their priorities straight. This is about preventing devastating birth defects in children infected with the Zika virus. We can have a discussion about climate change—hopefully without the attempt to intimidate and attack people who express opinions our colleagues don't agree with—but I suggest that our priorities ought to be a little bit different.

It is not just that this is a conscience effort to ignore the most pressing issues facing our country, such as fighting the Zika virus or funding our troops; they don't even want to have an honest conversation about the policies they are peddling because they are not interested in a debate, they want to stamp out contrary views.

For all their fanfare about climate change, this is not the most urgent thing we need to do this week. They don't talk about how the policies are advocating what actually stifled free speech and hurt the American economy and cut jobs. We have had debates and votes in this body about some of these sweeping proposals to deal with the problem that may or may not actually come to pass. There have been other challenges we faced in this country that have been overcome due to the inventiveness, innovation, and genius of the American people in coming up with solutions.

I hope our colleagues who have latched on to this as a way to divert attention from the imminent threat of the Zika virus and the need to fund our troops will come back into a zone—not a logic-free zone—where we can talk about these issues. And instead of trying to score political points with outside groups who are happy to raise money off of this issue, we need to get back to reality and back to the work at hand.

Quite frankly, it is hard to believe this is where we are, with our Democratic friends arguing against bills that would help prevent birth defects in our children and support our troops. Instead, they want to grandstand on climate change. I hope they get a reality check soon and stop quibbling over bicameral, bipartisan pieces of legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to address two issues which the Senate Finance Committee has spent a considerable amount of time on, and both of

them are examples of how the Senate is leaving important work undone on its way out the door. I am going to begin by discussing the opioid bill.

If ever there were an issue that ought to be unifying the Congress and bringing Democrats and Republicans together to surmount an important challenge, it ought to be opioid addiction in America. This is a crisis indiscriminate of geography and politics. The reality is that opioid addiction is ripping through our communities like wildfire. A recent editorial in one of my home State newspapers captured the extreme urgency of the opioid struggle, the addiction, with this statement: "Opioids are winning."

After months of work, the Senate and House have come up with an opioid bill. I can give my assessment in a sentence: It is a half-measure. The job is far from complete, and certainly nobody ought to be taking victory laps. The reality is that this opioid bill leaves many opportunities to fight and successfully win the battle against opioid addiction on the negotiating table.

A landmark study dealing with opioids came out a few months ago and found that 80 percent of those who were addicted to painkillers or heroin weren't getting treatment.

I want everybody to understand that under this bill, those waiting lines are not going to get much shorter. The thousands of babies born each year with an addiction to narcotics—this bill won't be enough to bring that number down to zero, where everybody knows it should be. And there is a moral imperative to actually get it to zero. That is why there are headlines stating that opioids are winning the war.

The package before the Senate certainly has the kernels of a meaningful game plan, but, in my view, there is just not enough there. There are programs being established that could be a big help to those who are struggling to get their lives back on track, but there aren't the tools to deliver on that promise.

Senators should know that doing only half the job now means that Members are going to be leading with their chins when the appropriations process returns later this year. The reason I say that is there are some programs that are going to be bumping up against the uncertainty of the appropriations process.

There is a program for pregnant women and new mothers suffering from an opioid-use disorder.

There is a program to help States take important strides when it comes to monitoring prescription drugs.

There is better tracking within the VA.

There is a plan to strengthen the network of support in American communities that is best equipped to reach out to those who need support in fighting addiction, which includes physicians, employers, the criminal justice system, and more.

The bill green-lights the National Institutes of Health putting new energy into the development of safe, non-addictive, effective, and affordable drugs and treatments for chronic pain.

The bill establishes a task force and grants for States to construct what I believe could be a fresh approach to pain management and opioids, including education programs, treatment, recovery efforts, prescription monitoring, and strategies to prevent overdose.

Getting those proposals off the ground is a first step, but with the Senate on its way out the door, it seems to me that you also have to do more than just leave the strategy for actually winning against opioid addiction to the uncertainty of the appropriations process in the fall.

There are other questions about this bill. I am very concerned about the provision that gives \$75 million in special kickbacks to the manufacturers of opioids that are considered under the bill "abuse deterrents." I believe it is wrong for the bill, which only does half the job for Americans struggling with addiction, to then turn around and give an unjustified windfall to big drug companies. I offered an amendment to get rid of the windfall, and it was very simple. I said: Let's give that money to pregnant women who are enrolled in Medicaid, women of limited means who are struggling to fight addiction. But the choice was made to give the windfall to the drug companies rather than to help those vulnerable women who are trying to get their lives back on track. We shouldn't be giving funding to programs that really help women and others who are trying to overcome addiction and then turn around and give a \$75 million windfall to drug companies. That, in my view, is an imbalance that does not pass the smell test.

The bottom line on the opioid legislation is that there is an awful lot of heavy lifting to do before anybody ought to think about taking a victory lap. My State—and it pains me to say this—is the fourth worst State in the country when it comes to opioid abuse. I hear from Oregonians who have gone from pills, to heroin, to a tragic ending. I hear accounts that nobody could have ever dreamed of.

I was blessed to go to school on a basketball scholarship. Nobody heard about basketball players who had an injury getting hooked on opioids and having tragic, premature endings and opportunities choked off. We didn't hear those stories then, but we hear them now.

I have heard from doctors and pharmacists about the dangers drugs pose and the difficulty of treating pain safely. I hear from community leaders who are trying fresh approaches to reach out to young people. My sense is that every single Member of the Senate is hearing these kinds of stories.

I want it understood that the opioid addiction crisis is going to keep raging unabated. Lives are going to continue

to be lost and families are going to continue to be torn apart until the Senate finishes the rest of the job, and the rest of the job is still ahead of us.

NOMINATION OF MARY WAKEFIELD

Mr. President, I have unfinished business that needs to be addressed, and that is the yearlong obstruction in front of the Senate Finance Committee on a supremely qualified nominee, Dr. Mary Wakefield, who is the President's choice to be the Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services. Her nomination has been sitting in purgatory longer than any other such choice in history, and it is for reasons that have absolutely nothing to do with her qualifications.

I am going to talk about what is causing the holdup, but I want to spend a little bit of time talking about Dr. Wakefield and the important role she has been nominated to fill. She is up for the No. 2 spot at Health and Human Services, which would make her the chief operating officer of a Department that is taking on some of our most important health challenges, including opioid addiction. They manage the most important health programs in the country. This Department is on the frontlines in the battle against Zika. They run the Centers for Disease Control, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, child welfare programs, family support programs, and it goes on and on.

I felt from the outset that she was the right person for this job. She is somebody who has seen the American health care system from all sides. She comes from rural America. She hails from North Dakota and sought out more opportunities to help individuals by working in policy and managing programs. She was a nurse, and she said: I want to do more, and I am going to be able to do it by learning more about these health policies. So she earned a master's degree, a Ph.D., and then she served as a legislative assistant and chief of staff in the Senate. She has proven herself most able as the head of the Health Resources and Services Administration. This is almost a textbook case of somebody qualified to do this job.

When the Finance Committee met in February to discuss her nomination, she was winning plaudits from both sides of the aisle. My friend, Chairman HATCH, said Dr. Wakefield has an "impressive background and a reputation for being a problem solver." Those are not my words. They are the words of Chairman HATCH.

Senator HOEVEN, who introduced Dr. Wakefield at that hearing, said, "She is a dedicated public servant and a hard-working health care advocate."

And Senator HOEVEN, whom we all respect, like Senator HATCH, made the important point that Dr. Wakefield is an advocate especially for rural America. She believes Americans deserve access to high-quality health care, regardless of their ZIP Code, and she has certainly walked the walk as a nurse and as a practitioner.

Senator HOEVEN encouraged the Finance Committee to support Dr. Wakefield's nomination and "send her to the full Senate for confirmation."

Unfortunately, this process of moving this highly qualified nominee has ground to a halt. There have been kind of two stages of this process. First, in February, Senator GRASSLEY indicated he would put a hold on the nomination on the ground that he and other Republican Senators had not received adequate responses to the questions they had raised about Planned Parenthood. Now, these questions had absolutely nothing to do with what Dr. Wakefield had been involved in. Senator GRASSLEY's questions were answered months ago, but as soon as that was accomplished, there was another objection.

In March, the Republican members of the Finance Committee sent a letter to the inspector general raising questions about a complaint against the State of California regarding what is the so-called Weldon amendment. The amendment prohibits recipients of appropriated funds from discriminating against health care providers who do not cover abortion services. We were told the Wakefield nomination could not be considered until those issues with respect to California and the Weldon amendment were resolved.

Once again, we are seeing issues raised that have absolutely nothing to do with Dr. Wakefield, a nurse, someone who hails from rural America, who Republican Senators say is eminently qualified, to be held up for matters that had nothing to do with her nomination. She wasn't the subject of the investigation. She didn't work in California. There has been no allegation she has been involved in any way in the matters being investigated.

Several weeks ago, the Office of Civil Rights concluded their investigation of California and the Weldon amendment. It concluded the Weldon amendment had not been violated, really not even implicated, because none of the parties bringing the complaint were even covered by the amendment. So as a matter of law, there was no violation.

Now, one would normally think that would finally clear the decks; no issues left related to Dr. Wakefield's nomination. Even the issues unrelated to her nomination had been resolved. So one would think we would be ready to go, ready to forward the nomination. That has not been the case. My understanding is, on the other side of the aisle, Republican members of the Finance Committee are still unwilling to favorably report the nomination.

So a highly qualified nominee is being needlessly blocked for reasons that—and I have spent a lot of time digging into this—are completely unrelated to her qualifications and the position she has been nominated to.

It just seems to me the people we represent deserve more when it comes to the consideration of vital nominees—vital nominees like Dr. Wakefield—and legislation that ought to

really shorten those waiting lines for opioid treatment and respond fully to the challenge of opioid addiction. The Congress ought to be doing its job. It ought to be doing more than making political points and passing half measures.

I will close by way of saying that I think as much as any Member of this body, I have made a commitment to working in a bipartisan way. It is what I want to be the hallmark of my time in public service. I will just close by way of saying that I think both fighting opioid addiction and making sure that qualified people who have been recommended by senior Republicans can actually be considered here in both instances. The Congress and the Senate owe more to the American people.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS AND PELL GRANTS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I was interested to hear my good friend talk about the uncertainty of the appropriations process. Frankly, I think we could debate no issue that would change the Congress more totally than the issue of getting back to the certainty of the appropriations process.

For 200 years, the principal work of the Congress—the House and the Senate—was to set our national priorities based on how we spend our national trust of the money given to this government by the people who pay taxes, the revenue of the government. We have gotten out of the habit of doing that. Frankly, one of the reasons we have an authorizing process—and have always had that—and an appropriating process is because that gave the Congress the annual ability to look at those programs, see how they were working, see if they were still working, and gave the Congress the ability to reach out to a program and have that program answer every question because there was an annual review of how we spent the money. If there is an incredible indictment over the last 7 years, it is that the Senate has stopped doing that work.

The Republican-led Appropriations Committees over the last 2 years have had all the bills ready for the first time in a long time—ready to do the work and ready to talk about the priorities of the country and, maybe more importantly, ready for the 30 people who serve on the Appropriations Committee to not be the only people who get to offer amendments, to not be the only people who ask and answer questions, and to not be the only people who get a say in this process. That is why these bills need to be on the floor.

What a tragedy this week and last week that the Defense appropriations bill—the primary responsibility of the Federal Government to defend the country—that bill isn't even allowed to be debated by the minority because they say: We want to see what the final bill will say before we are ready to de-

bate the Senate version. There is no government—bicameral, two legislative body chart in the world—that shows how one group decides what the final bill looks like before the other body of the Congress is allowed to pass a bill. That is just not the way this works. There is a Senate bill, there is a House bill, and those two bills come together.

The country, for good reasons, has forgotten the basic civics of how our democracy works because the Senate particularly has been such an obstacle to that democracy working for 7 years now. For 5 years, we were not able to amend the bills, and that was a reason not to go forward, and by the way it was a good reason not to go forward. Then, for 2 years, we didn't want to debate the bills because apparently we didn't know what they were going to say before they got to the President's desk. That is not how this process is supposed to work.

Last month, for the first time in 7 years, the Senate Appropriations Committee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education passed a bipartisan bill. It came out of the full committee 29 to 1. That is a good vote, but that still means 70 of the Senators haven't gotten to weigh in on what that bill should look like. If that was the case, it could be that other Senators who are concerned about opioid abuse—which I want to talk about in a minute—the Senators who are concerned about whether that is going to be funded would be less concerned if they knew we were back to the constitutional way of running the government.

As chairman of the Labor and Health and Human Services Committee, I was pleased we were able to write that bipartisan bill. Certainly, Senator MURRAY, the leading Democrat, didn't get everything she wanted in this bill, and I didn't get everything I wanted in this bill, but we were willing to set priorities. One of the priorities I want to talk about for a few minutes, before we all go home and have a chance to talk about the good things that could happen in the country if we will just do our job—one of those priorities will be returning to year-round Pell grants.

Pell grants are the grants available to people who, because of their family income or their personal income, qualify for not a student loan but actually a student grant. Until 2008, we had several years where you could go to school, and you could go to school year-round, and still have access to those Pell grant funds.

Recently, I was at Harris-Stowe State University in St. Louis. I was at Mineral Area College, I was at Ozarks Technical College, Missouri State University in Springfield, and I was at Three Rivers Community College in Poplar Bluff talking about what happens if people are able to stay in school once they get in school.

One of the students I talked to at Harris-Stowe is Tierra Wilson, a 21-

year-old senior who was about to graduate. She was going to school pretty much on her own resources, her own part-time job. She needed to get done as soon as she could so she decided to take summer classes, but since she didn't have the opportunity for a year-round Pell—she could only get the Pell grant for two semesters instead of the way it was until 2008—she could only get that money for two semesters so she had to borrow the \$3,000 it took her to finish her degree sooner. The good news is, she is going to finish her degree. The bad news for her is, she has an additional \$3,000 debt that she wouldn't have had.

The newspaper the Joplin Globe recently shared a story about another student who also recently has gone to school on Pell grants, Andy Hamon. He is a senior. His mom and dad run a small business. According to that story, he has always depended on financial aid because his family didn't have the resources to pay tuition. He said it hasn't been easy. He said he had to take classes in the summer, and when he did take classes in the summer, he had to borrow or out-of-pocket come up with the \$800 to \$10,000 the Pell grant will not cover.

When I was at Mineral Area Community College, the president of Mineral Area Community College, Dr. Steve Kurtz, said, when you talk about affordability and accessibility, you are right in the middle of this discussion on what happens if you have access to help year-round as opposed to just two semesters a year.

Jean Merrill-Doss, who serves as the dean of student services at that college, says approximately 60 percent of their student body is dependent on Pell grants to attend school.

As a college student, I went to school as quickly as I could. Nobody in my family had graduated from college before. I went three years, three summers. It took 124 credit hours to graduate with a bachelor's degree. I had 124 credit hours. I didn't have an extra hour. I couldn't pay for an extra hour, in my view, and I needed to get college behind me or I might not be the first person in my family to graduate from college.

In fact, the first teaching job I took at Marshfield High School—my grandfather was the janitor. He had been the janitor, when I was growing up, at the school where I took my first job as a college graduate.

Students like Tierra, students like Andy need to have the opportunity we can give them to go to school and finish school.

Pell grants benefit about 7.5 million students annually. The maximum two-semester Pell grant will be \$5,815 in the school year that begins next fall. The \$5,815 pays for tuition, fees, books at every community college in Missouri, and we have a big community college system. So for people who have the most economic need, we already have free 2 years of college in our State, and

in a couple of our universities you can still get all your tuition, all your books, all the fees paid for with a Pell grant.

What is the advantage of being able to stay in school once you get started in school? The Presiding Officer and I are two of the three university presidents here in the Senate. So we have talked to many students who had to have financial aid and had to have help to go. If you are the first person in your family to graduate from college or you are going back to school—maybe you are taking a break, you didn't go to college, or college didn't work out—and you are an adult and totally responsible for all of your college expenses if you are going to go, staying in school makes a big difference. If you decide you can't go that summer semester because you can't afford the tuition and you get the full-time summer job, it is real easy for the full-time summer job to turn into this: Well, I will do this job one more semester, and I will get into school in January. In January it is easy to think: Well, I will go ahead and finish my job and save a little more money, and I will get back into school at the regular time next fall. Before you know it, life gets in the way, things happen, and you intend to continue to go to school, finish, and get your degree, but it somehow doesn't happen.

Those students who want to continue their class work year-round should have access to the Pell grant help that you would have if you were a little more flexible and had a little more ability to take a part-time job in the summer, live at home with your mom and dad, and do whatever you are doing there and start back in the fall. Year-round Pell is not for everybody, but it is expected that an estimated 1 million students of the 7.7 million students that get Pell would take advantage of year-round Pell, and that includes 20,000 Missouri students who would take advantage of year-round Pell. They would get an average of \$1,650 each to take advantage of that other semester—another semester to catch up, another semester to get ahead, or another semester to just graduate faster. This is something we need to do and should do.

OPPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, I want to speak for a couple of minutes about the other topic that was just discussed—opioids. Clearly, this is a problem. About 1,000 Missourians every year die from opioid overdoses. In St. Louis alone, deaths related to opioid abuse have increased three times since 2007. An estimated 5.9 million American adults have an opioid use disorder. This is truly a public health crisis in every corner of the nation, from our major cities to our rural communities. There is some evidence that rural communities even have a bigger problem with opioid abuse than in the city.

I was visiting over the Fourth of July weekend with some St. Louis fire-

fighters who were also in the first responder team, and it is clear that this is something where 10 or 15 times a day, and even more on weekends, they are responding to opioid overdoses. If you are in a fire department in America today that also has a first responder unit, you are three times more likely to go to an overdose than you are to go to a fire.

The good news is there is treatment. Seventy-two percent of the Missourians who went through the State's opioid treatment program, having been tested, were found to be negative afterward with any random test. So there is a solution here. The problem is that only about 10 percent of the people who have the problem get into the program to solve the problem.

That is why yesterday the bill was passed that I co-sponsored that dealt with the idea of opioid abuse. This agreement expands access to evidence-based treatment and recovery services and focuses on proven strategies that strengthen people's ability not to get addicted and, if they are addicted, to figure out how to no longer be addicted.

In this appropriation, we recommended a 93-percent increase in the money available. One of the issues that Senator WYDEN was concerned about was whether there would be enough money. Between last year and this year, we increased the money by 542 percent. It takes an unbelievably effective government agency to deal with a more than 542-percent increase. We are going to continue to watch the bill, to watch the need, to see and do everything possible to see that the money is available.

The House has ideas here. We do too. First responders are not the people who need to be primarily focused on this job. They need to be there when they need to be there, but we have to do something that solves this problem.

People need a place to go. That is why the Excellence in Mental Health Act will have at least 6 States, and as many as 24 States, on January 1, treating mental health like all other health, providing an important access point for mental health issues of all kinds and opioid issues that can only be dealt with in that context of overall health involving mental health.

I hope we will begin to work more openly, more transparently, and more committed to solving problems than we are committed to just complaining about problems.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS DENTAL INSURANCE RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 3055 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3055) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a dental insurance plan to veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BLUNT. I ask unanimous consent that the bill 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 bill (S. 3055) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3055

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 “Department of Veterans Affairs Dental Insurance Reauthorization Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. DENTAL INSURANCE PLAN FOR VETERANS AND SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS OF VETERANS.

(a) DENTAL INSURANCE PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1712B the following new section:

“§ 1712C. Dental insurance plan for veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and administer a dental insurance plan for veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans described in subsection (b).

“(b) COVERED VETERANS AND SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS.—The veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans described in this subsection are as follows:

“(1) Any veteran who is enrolled in the system of annual patient enrollment under section 1705 of this title.

“(2) Any survivor or dependent of a veteran who is eligible for medical care under section 1781 of this title.

“(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall contract with a dental insurer to administer the dental insurance plan under this section.

“(d) BENEFITS.—The dental insurance plan under this section shall provide such benefits for dental care and treatment as the Secretary considers appropriate for the dental insurance plan, including diagnostic services, preventative services, endodontics and other restorative services, surgical services, and emergency services.

“(e) ENROLLMENT.—(1) Enrollment in the dental insurance plan under this section shall be voluntary.

“(2) Enrollment in the dental insurance plan shall be for such minimum period as the Secretary shall prescribe for purposes of this section.

“(f) PREMIUMS.—(1) Premiums for coverage under the dental insurance plan under this section shall be in such amount or amounts as the Secretary shall prescribe to cover all costs associated with carrying out this section.

“(2) The Secretary shall adjust the premiums payable under this section for coverage under the dental insurance plan on an annual basis. Each individual covered by the dental insurance plan at the time of such an adjustment shall be notified of the amount and effective date of such adjustment.

“(3) Each individual covered by the dental insurance plan shall pay the entire premium for coverage under the dental insurance plan, in addition to the full cost of any copayments.

“(g) VOLUNTARY DISENROLLMENT.—(1) With respect to enrollment in the dental insurance plan under this section, the Secretary shall—

“(A) permit the voluntary disenrollment of an individual in the dental insurance plan if the disenrollment occurs during the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enrollment of the individual in the dental insurance plan; and

“(B) permit the voluntary disenrollment of an individual in the dental insurance plan for such circumstances as the Secretary shall prescribe for purposes of this subsection, but only to the extent such disenrollment does not jeopardize the fiscal integrity of the dental insurance plan.

“(2) The circumstances prescribed under paragraph (1)(B) shall include the following:

“(A) If an individual enrolled in the dental insurance plan relocates to a location outside the jurisdiction of the dental insurance plan that prevents use of the benefits under the dental insurance plan.

“(B) If an individual enrolled in the dental insurance plan is prevented by a serious medical condition from being able to obtain benefits under the dental insurance plan.

“(C) Such other circumstances as the Secretary shall prescribe for purposes of this subsection.

“(3) The Secretary shall establish procedures for determinations on the permissibility of voluntary disenrollments under paragraph (1)(B). Such procedures shall ensure timely determinations on the permissibility of such disenrollments.

“(h) RELATIONSHIP TO DENTAL CARE PROVIDED BY SECRETARY.—Nothing in this section shall affect the responsibility of the Secretary to provide dental care under section 1712 of this title, and the participation of an individual in the dental insurance plan under this section shall not affect the entitlement of the individual to outpatient dental services and treatment, and related dental appliances, under such section 1712.

“(i) REGULATIONS.—The dental insurance plan under this section shall be administered under such regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe.

“(j) TERMINATION.—This section terminates on December 31, 2021.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 17 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1712B the following new item:

“1712C. Dental insurance plan for veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans.”

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 510 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 38 U.S.C. 1712 note) is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 is amended by striking the item relating to section 510.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Vermont.

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, while the Senator from Missouri is still on the

floor, I noted what my friend said about his being the first member of his family to get a college degree.

The Leahys came to Vermont in 1850. When my grandfather—who was a stone carver—died, my father was a teenager, and he had to go to work. I became the first LEAHY to get a college degree, and my sister was the second one. I have to think what the path might have been otherwise. There is one thing we all have to agree on: We have to make it easier for college to be affordable, with all kinds of plans and ideas. The kids have to be able to go to college. I was able to do that. I was able to go on to graduate school. It is so important to be able to compete today. I was touched by what my friend said, and I appreciate it.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. President, we have kind of a good news/bad news situation today. The good news is that Congress is taking a step forward on how to respond to opioid addiction. By advancing the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, we are leaving behind decades-old misconceptions about how to confront addiction.

For too long, Congress relied on punitive measures that only served to push addicts further underground and away from recovery. This legislation treats opioid addiction as an illness. It combats it as we would any other public health issue, through a commitment to evidence-based treatment and recovery programs. But the bad news is our commitment falls short.

The conference report promises critical programming, but then it does not pay the bill. It does not provide the resources necessary to support the programming. So we should know what we have here. We have a first step—an important first step but barely a first step. If we make a mistake and say: OK, we have done our job, then we have failed the countless communities across the country grappling with addiction. We are doing very little to stem this epidemic.

I am afraid my friends, the Republicans, have repeatedly blocked efforts to fund the programs authorized by CARA. When the legislation was first considered on the Senate floor, Republicans opposed Senator SHAHEEN’s amendment that would have provided \$600 million in new funding of emergency supplemental appropriations, which is actually a modest amount considering what is needed in this country.

Then we have the appropriations process in committee this year. Emergency funds to fight this addiction epidemic were denied. Senate Republicans kept assuring us that there was going to be a time and a place to include real funding. Well, last week’s conference provided such an opportunity. I, along with other Democratic conferees, identified commonsense and bipartisan off-sets that would enable us to dedicate almost \$1 billion in new resources to put the programs in CARA to work. We told our Republican counterparts we

could not sign the conference report unless it included meaningful funding, but the Republicans voted against funding CARA so I did not sign the report. They also made a new promise. At the conference meeting, the Republicans promised to include \$525 million in new funding to combat addiction through the appropriations process. I have to note that I hope Americans demand that Congress keep this promise and provide meaningful funding for CARA—not with poison pill offsets that would kill it but with real promises.

I will soon again join with Senators MURRAY, WYDEN, and SHAHEEN to introduce legislation to provide \$920 million to fund CARA. It could be fully paid for. It could be paid for with offsets that received overwhelming bipartisan support. If we are really serious about combatting the opioid epidemic, there is no sense not to pass this, and there is no sense not to put our money where our mouths are, because, if we fund it, it can make an important difference. We can expand prevention efforts, expand access to treatment and recovery services, and authorize the critical public health programs to create and expand Medication Assisted Treatment, MAT, programs.

If CARA were funded, it could make an important difference in communities across the country. The bill lays the groundwork for expanding prevention efforts and access to treatment and recovery services. It removes arbitrary restrictions on prescribing Medication Assisted Treatment, which will allow nurse practitioners and physician assistants in Vermont to treat addiction just as they treat other illnesses. It authorizes a critical public health program I helped create to expand MAT programs. Some Vermonters tell me they are struggling with addiction and they have had to wait nearly 1 year to receive treatment. At the Chittenden Clinic in South Burlington, VT, several have died while waiting. Because we wouldn't fund it, several died. This story is not unique.

The bill also includes my provision to support our rural communities by increasing access to the overdose reversal drug naloxone. Rural locations have the highest death rates in the country from opioid poisoning, and getting this drug into more hands will save lives.

The Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act also recognizes that the overprescription of opioids is largely responsible for this epidemic, and the legislation includes a provision I strongly support to encourage the National Institutes of Health to intensify research on the effectiveness of opioids in treating chronic pain and to encourage the development of opioid-alternatives to manage chronic pain.

Two weeks ago, on a beautiful Vermont evening, a standing-room only crowd filled a conference room at the Green Mountain Technical and Career Center for a community meeting on opioid abuse. The event was orga-

nized by Lamoille County Sheriff Roger Marcoux. He is a former DEA agent who has seen the toll of heroin and opioid abuse and what it has done in the rural regions of my State.

Dr. Betsy Perez, a panelist and long-time practitioner at nearby Copley Hospital, surprised many in the crowd when she addressed the opioid issue from a personal rather than from a medical perspective. This doctor told the heart-wrenching story of her addicted daughter's journey.

Despite many efforts at treatment, her daughter repeatedly relapsed, eventually winding up homeless on the streets of Burlington. Her daughter is now 2 years into recovery and recently became a mother. The cost of her intensive residential treatment was high. It drained the doctor's retirement savings. But she would have it no other way. I wonder how much better off they might have been if we had prevention clinics in place.

I held a hearing in St. Albans, VT—again, standing room only. I remember a noted pediatrician who spoke about being with parents whom he did not identify. He said they were well off. He was telling them about the dangers of opioids and how teenagers can get addicted. They were shocked to hear this.

They said: Thank you for telling us about this. We will watch out for our daughter.

He said: I have been treating your daughter for 2 years. She is an addict.

You could hear a pin drop in that room. But she was getting treatment, and many are not so fortunate. Each day, throughout our country, 129 people die from drug overdoses. I suspect that almost every Vermonter knows someone who has been impacted by addiction. This is not the future we want for our children, our grandchildren, our communities. In Vermont, we know what it takes to get ahead of addiction. While I appreciate the attention Congress has given this issue, CARA will only work for Vermont and States across the country if Congress is willing to provide the funding that is necessary to fight this epidemic.

I was proud to help usher CARA through the Senate. I will support it today. But I am greatly disappointed that Congress has so far refused to treat this public health crisis as seriously as it did the swine flu or Ebola.

I would urge all Senators: Don't go just to formal meetings. Just stand outside your local grocery stores, as my wife, a registered nurse, and I often do. Just talk with people. Walk down the street, and talk with people. You are going to find what Vermonters know all too well: Lives are at stake here, and time is of the essence. It is time for Congress to act like it and fully fund CARA.

I know when Marcelle and I go home, we want to say that we are helping because we know some of these families personally. In a little State of only 600,000 people, you tend to know a lot of people. I have seen some of the finest

families in our State devastated by this. I am sure it is the same in the Presiding Officer's State and every other State in this country. We have to represent the people from our States and help.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. 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. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLICE AND COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, as our Nation confronts what increasingly feels like a weakening of the bond between law enforcement and the communities they serve, I rise to urge all of my colleagues to examine the relationship between police and communities of color. One year ago, I joined the Democratic members of the Senate Judiciary Committee in urging our colleagues to convene hearings on this critical issue.

The Justice Department had recently made public the, frankly, shocking findings on its investigation into the Ferguson Police Department, which found that the city engaged in a pattern and practice of constitutional violations. But the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over matters relating to civil liberties and criminal proceedings, and entire subcommittees devoted exclusively to matters of crime and to the protection of constitutional rights held no hearings on the broader issue. No proposals were debated by the whole committee, no testimony heard.

We had already lost Eric Garner, Michael Brown, Tamir Rice, and Freddie Gray. And rather than honor our obligation to confront this problem head-on, rather than engage in difficult conversations about race and about persistent inequality, we allowed these problems to be met with silence.

It must be said that we owe a debt of gratitude to the brave officers who worked tirelessly to keep us safe from harm. Every day, they put their lives on the line to protect our safety and that of our families. But we are doing a disservice to the noble men and women of that profession and to the communities they serve by turning away from unpleasant facts and by refusing to talk about them.

That silence carries a terrible price. Last week, a 32-year-old man named Philando Castile was pulled over for driving with a broken taillight in Falcon Heights, MN. It was the 53rd time he had been pulled over in just a few short years. His girlfriend Diamond was beside him. Her 4-year-old daughter Dae'Anna was in the back seat. We

don't know precisely what happened as Philando spoke to the officer who approached the car. We don't know what the two men said to each other, but we know how that encounter ended. Philando died after suffering multiple gunshot wounds.

Philando's community—our community—in Minnesota is devastated. That community includes Philando's family, his loved ones, and his friends. It also includes the staff and the children in the elementary school where Philando worked; he knew them all by name. And it includes the parents of those children, many of whom began the morning after his death by explaining to their kids that Phil wouldn't be at school anymore.

The impact of Philando's death has been felt far beyond those who knew him. In Dallas, as people seeking justice for Philando and his family gathered in a peaceful protest, a deeply troubled man murdered five members of a police force shielding demonstrators from gunfire. And over the weekend, protests in St. Paul took a vicious turn as protesters pelted police with rocks and chunks of concrete.

Such violence does not honor the lives of those we have lost. It does not advance the cause of justice. Rather, violence makes it more difficult for our communities to begin the long and difficult healing process.

From the suburbs of St. Paul to downtown Dallas, our communities are in pain, and it is our responsibility as lawmakers to do something about it. We cannot take the steps necessary to confront this challenge if we fear acknowledging that it exists. We cannot solve this problem without coming together as a nation to address and dismantle the systemic racial injustices that lead to far too many of these deaths and to identify solutions. We cannot solve this problem if we run away from it.

But running from it is precisely what this body will do. In just a few short days, the Senate will adjourn for 7 weeks. During that time, our communities will continue to endure anguish, heartache, and pain. I hope every Senator uses this time to meet with people who have been touched by these events and to better understand the challenges that we face and they face. I urge them to join me in working to address them.

When asked about her son's death, Philando's mother said: "All we want is justice." And she deserves nothing less.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. President, I wish to turn to another important issue: the Zika virus outbreak, its devastating impact on families, and—I hate to say this—the Republican obstructionism that is preventing us from taking meaningful action to address this outbreak.

As you know, the Zika virus is transmitted to people primarily through the bite of an infected mosquito, but it can also be transmitted through sexual

contact, through blood transfusions, or from mother to child. While it typically causes no symptoms or mild illness in adults, we now know that a Zika virus infection during pregnancy can cause microcephaly and other severe birth defects. In fact, the World Health Organization has declared this outbreak a public health emergency of international concern. In some countries, Zika virus transmission is so high that public health officials have asked women to delay their pregnancies.

While other countries are feeling the brunt of this outbreak, Zika is also affecting us here at home. So far, there have been over 1,100 people in the continental United States who have been affected by the Zika virus while traveling to endemic countries. This includes 320 who are currently pregnant. We are already seeing local transmission in U.S. territories, where 2,500 additional people have been infected, and these are just the confirmed cases. The actual number of those infected is likely to be much, much higher.

This is why over 140 days ago President Obama asked Congress for emergency funds to respond to the Zika virus outbreak. His request, drawing on the expertise of public health experts, sought funds for things such as mosquito control, vaccine and drug development, and diagnostics so that more people can get tested and receive their results faster.

After weeks of deliberation, the Senate eventually reached a bipartisan compromise. Although we didn't get all the money we need to fight the virus, we did get \$1.1 billion. Democrats and Republicans in the Senate negotiated in good faith and got a bipartisan package that included important provisions to combat the Zika virus. That is why 68 Members of the U.S. Senate, including 22 Republicans, voted for the Senate bill.

Unfortunately, that bipartisan spirit has not prevailed. As it turned out, Republicans in the House of Representatives delayed and then derailed the funding request. Even though the Senate passed a bipartisan compromise, House Republicans, with support from Republican Senate negotiators, sent back a partisan package packed with ideological poison pill provisions. These included provisions that deliberately block funds from going to family planning clinics, take away money from the continuing fight against Ebola, and even erode provisions in the Clean Water Act.

Let me explain some of these provisions in more detail. The bill the House and Senate Republican negotiators sent back to us limits women's access to contraceptive services. Imagine that. At a time when many women have decided to delay their pregnancies out of fear of the Zika virus, my Republican colleagues are actively working to keep birth control out of reach. Such provisions disproportionately harm low-income women who turn to

safety net clinics such as Planned Parenthood for birth control and for education on family planning.

Two weeks ago, one of my Republican colleagues addressed this issue on the floor of the Senate. Standing next to a photo of a baby girl with microcephaly, he argued that Democratic objections to the bill were "fanciful and imagined." That is what he said—"fanciful and imagined." He dismissed the idea that Planned Parenthood was deliberately targeted in this legislation since it was not mentioned by name in the text. But it is actually that intention that is fanciful.

Because of the way the legislation is crafted, it excludes family planning clinics such as Planned Parenthood from receiving funds. This is particularly harmful in places like Puerto Rico, where infection rates are rising rapidly and high numbers of uninsured women need access to information about the virus, as well as effective birth control.

This kind of tactic is deeply counterproductive. To combat this virus, we must rely on the strength of our entire medical system and not sideline the country's most experienced family planning providers.

Second, Republicans have criticized Democrats for asking for more money, describing our vote against their bipartisan package as "disgraceful." Let me describe what is disgraceful. This Republican bill, unlike any other recent emergency spending bill, actually takes money away from efforts to control Ebola outbreaks—which are still active in Africa—in order to pay for Zika.

I would like to remind my colleagues that a short time ago Ebola ravaged West Africa, infecting more than 28,000 people and killing over 11,000, making it the deadliest Ebola outbreak on record.

While research is under way, we do not yet have a vaccine against this virus. Ebola is still an active threat. In fact, since the 2014 outbreak, there have been several new clusters of Ebola virus due to the virus's persistence in survivors. Public health experts warn that this virus will return; the question is whether we will be ready. At this juncture it would be irresponsible to cut funding from Ebola research, surveillance, and public health infrastructure. The Republican strategy to fight the Zika virus would do just that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 1½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Thank you.

Finally—see, I was going to say "finally" anyway.

Finally, the bill even waives permitting requirements when it comes to applying pesticides near bodies of water. This clean water requirement was intended to protect people from toxic

substances, particularly pregnant women, children, and other vulnerable populations. But my colleagues are mischaracterizing our objection to this rider. In fact, one of my colleagues went to the Senate floor recently and accused the Democrats of being “more focused on protecting the mosquito than they are protecting people.” That is just absurd.

To sum up, my Democratic colleagues and I supported the Senate bill to fund the fight against a devastating disease, and Republicans decided to politicize this issue by sending back a conference report that was filled with partisan policy riders.

Every day that we don't act, this virus continues to spread. And, in the meantime, the Republican leader has not given any indications that he plans to change course. In fact, he said he plans to bring up the same exact partisan bill that was defeated last week.

The President has already threatened to veto this bill, so another vote would be useless.

I urge my Republican colleagues: Please, please stop playing partisan politics, and let's pass something meaningful to address this crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, at the moment, we are considering the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration, and I am disappointed by what we are about to do today, although at this point there appears to be no option. This extension fails to accomplish significant and important reforms in the aviation world, and it is something we were able to do, should have been able to do, and almost accomplished. As a result of our failure, I will oppose the reauthorization legislation we will vote on in just a few moments.

Three weeks ago, I came to the Senate floor to express my concern with what was happening, and my plea and request to our House colleagues to act on the FAA reauthorization bill as the Senate sent it to them—the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2016, which in April passed the Senate by the unusual vote of 95 votes in favor—broadly supported.

I serve on the Commerce Committee, and Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON worked hard with all of us on that committee to see that a wide variety of interests, a wide variety of opportunities were explored for us to make improvements in the world of aviation.

The way it works is, we have a piece of legislation that is in effect and will soon expire, and we are up against a deadline for that extension, but we knew that. In fact, we went to work early. The Senate Commerce Committee began hearings a long time ago—months ago. We worked hard to find consensus, and we did. Our product came to the Senate floor not just with a simple reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration but with

items that were so important to this country's economy, to those who utilize general aviation, to communities that care about their local airports, and to those—in my case in Kansas—who care about how many jobs we have and can continue to have and how many more we can create as a result of the manufacturing of aircraft in this country. So we did what we were supposed to do in the Senate. We worked together and found solutions. We found compromises, and we passed legislation overwhelmingly.

Unfortunately, when it went to the House of Representatives, no action was taken in the House. As I said, the clock is ticking and the FAA will no longer continue to have legal authority to exist. Once again, as has happened in years gone by, we are left with a take-it-or-leave-it situation. We either take the House-passed extension or the FAA shuts down. There is no need for us to be in the position we are in today, and the extension we are going to vote on will be missing many important provisions included in the Senate-passed bill.

My perspective on this certainly is as a Kansan, but it matters no matter what State you live in. Kansas is an aviation State. General aviation is our State's largest industry, and our largest city is Wichita, which is appropriately known as the air capital of the world. Kansas aviation workers have supplied three out of every four general aviation aircraft since the Wright brothers' first flight at Kitty Hawk, and today some 42,000 Kansans make a living manufacturing, operating, and servicing the world's highest quality aircraft.

So what does the FAA reauthorization—the extension we are about to vote on—have to do with those jobs in Kansas? What does it have to do with jobs in this country? If we have a goal we ought to be working on together to achieve, it would be to create more opportunities for more Americans to have better jobs. We need—and we all know it—a strong manufacturing sector in this economy. Yet we will fail to take advantage of the opportunity to increase the chances of more manufacturing jobs, more general aviation jobs, more airplane manufacturing jobs in the United States—more jobs for Americans, better jobs for Americans, more secure jobs for Americans—because we aren't able to do today—the House was unwilling to include in the extension those things that increase the chances the aviation industry in our country can better compete with those in a global economy that are our competitors.

What the manufacturing side of aviation needs, what aviation manufacturers in Kansas need is the ability to compete in a global marketplace so the industry remains our country's No. 1 net exporter. This requires significant reforms at the FAA, particularly in their certification process and improvements in the regulatory environment.

These provisions that are so helpful were contained not just in the Senate-passed bill but also in the original House FAA bill that was approved by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee earlier in the spring. So here we have a situation in which the House Transportation Committee, the Senate Commerce Committee—in fact, the full Senate—approves things that matter greatly to our country and, most importantly, to its workers, and yet today we come to the Senate with a relatively simple extension that ignores those important reforms and improvements.

These provisions that are not included in this extension would streamline aircraft certification, significantly improving efficiency, and better focus the FAA's valuable resources someplace else. These reforms would have had a positive impact upon our economy, on job security, and job creation. Both the House and Senate recognized the importance of this issue and advanced nearly identical certification reform language, but, as I said, for some reason that language no longer appears in this bill.

In addition to certification, there were lots of other issues we agreed upon. Among the members of our committee and among Members of the Senate, overwhelmingly popular bipartisan provisions were included in this bill originally in the Senate but are not included now in this simple extension, including things such as strengthening our Contract Tower Program, which is so important, particularly to rural communities.

Again, while I come from a State where we manufacture planes, I also represent a State in which general aviation, our pilots, and the airports which they utilize are important to communities across my State as we again try to compete in a global economy. The ability to bring a business customer to a small community that has a manufacturing plant is dependent upon airport and air services.

The language from section 1204 of the Senate-passed bill would have significantly reformed the cost-benefit eligibility rules for contract towers—again, this is a way we provide air safety for communities that are small and have small airports—strengthening the program and providing certainty once and for all for the 253 contract towers that handle nearly one-third of our tower operations nationwide. It was a good idea. It was broadly supported—supported in the House in the Transportation Committee, supported in the Senate in the Commerce Committee and on the Senate floor—but not included in today's simple extension.

Apparently, the reason these important reforms were excluded was so they could, at a later date, be used as a political bargaining chip. The House held these popular reforms hostage in an attempt to gain leverage and to later promote an effort to privatize our Nation's air traffic control system.

By putting on hold these long overdue, noncontroversial certification reforms, the Contract Tower Program, and others, Congress is damaging the business aviation industry and the people who work therein.

Not too long ago I spoke on this floor defending general aviation from the Obama administration's repeated attempts to end the accelerated depreciation schedule for general aviation aircraft. In my view, the proposal came as a clever political sound bite—the so-called corporate jet loophole—but in reality it would have meant thousands of jobs would be gone and the unemployment lines longer. The President's proposal would have accomplished nothing for the economy—not even a meaningful increase in tax revenues—and only would have hurt 1.2 million Americans who make their living building and servicing airplanes.

This makes today all the more disappointing. It is one thing for me to come to the floor and complain about an Obama administration proposal, but today I come to the Senate floor to complain about a Republican-controlled House that was unable to take advantage of an opportunity to pass a strong, long-term reauthorization bill and instead leaves us with a simple, short-term extension.

Of course, I believe fully that the leadership of my Commerce Committee—Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON—worked very hard at crafting this Senate-passed FAA bill. I am here in support of their efforts and express my disappointment that their efforts were not rewarded by the House of Representatives. I regret that because we did not have a willing partner in the House, we are left with a watered-down extension so we can further entertain other ideas at some other point in time while uncertainty continues.

While that uncertainty continues, the rest of the world can advance their efforts, particularly in airplane manufacturing, while we wait for improvements, efficiencies, and modernization in our own. While we wait for Congress to do its work, the rest of the world moves on, with the potential of taking away jobs from the manufacturing sector here in the United States.

Americans rightfully should expect, and do expect, leadership from their officials in Washington. At a time when this partisan dysfunction puts us in places in which we constantly find barriers in the legislative process, it sure seems to me to be a waste that this opportunity to pass meaningful bipartisan reforms and improvements that could have an immediate positive impact on our economy is foregone.

We have enough other problems around here in the way this place works. Here we had, in my view, a chance to grasp victory for the American people, for its workers, and for our economy. We failed to do it, and in the process and as a result of that failure, the ability of American manufacturers

to create jobs is diminished and Kansans are more at risk for their futures as a result of our failure to do our jobs.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to address my colleagues in the Senate, and I express my dissatisfaction and disappointment with the end product, recognizing the circumstance we now find ourselves in. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the FAA reauthorization we are going to be voting on, and I thank Senator MORAN for being here and talking about aviation in general and aviation manufacturing. He comes from a strong aviation manufacturing State, so I certainly support many of the things he said.

I certainly support making sure we continue to streamline our process, and it is one of the things left out of this legislation. So we need to do more on that effort. I certainly don't want people demonizing any aspect of aviation because they are all aviation jobs. People don't realize how many aviation jobs we have in the United States and the fact that we are still the top when it comes to aviation manufacturing jobs. So it shouldn't be a sector we relent on. We have a lot of work to do.

I would add to that list, though, the passage of the Export-Import Bank Board members so the Export-Import Bank can be functioning so we can actually approve aviation sales when we get them done, and this is for smaller aircraft or larger aircraft. It doesn't matter.

If we build the best product, we ought to be able to sell the best product around the globe. And we are still stuck on getting that nominee out of committee because of someone holding it up, and the fact that they are holding it up means we will go many more months before completing airplane sales.

I want to talk about some other provisions we are passing today. I am so proud to have worked with the chairman of the committee, whom I just saw pass here on the floor—I am sure he is going to speak in a moment—and the ranking member on very important aspects of aviation security.

First, we are doubling the number of terrorist-deterrent teams at U.S. airports and ground transportation. As we can see, these TSA teams are people who are very involved in making sure we handle security at our airports. This is a very important aspect of this legislation because, as we saw with the tragic events in Brussels and Istanbul, terrorists can attack us not just on airplanes or inside the security perimeter but outside security as well. So I think this legislation, thanks to Chairman

THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON, is giving us the workforce we need to enhance the use of bomb-sniffing dogs, strengthen perimeter security, expand training, respond to active shooter attacks, and make sure the outer limits of our airports are secure.

I am proud that many of these provisions we passed out of the Commerce Committee are contained in this legislation and that it is doubling the number of these TSA VIPR teams that conduct controls and make sure our passengers are secure. These teams consist of a combination of law enforcement, inspectors, explosive specialists, and, as I mentioned, bomb-sniffing dogs.

What is so important about those dogs is that they are one of our best deterrents, picking up explosive material and tracking down people, and that is what we need to have at our airports. I again thank Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON for putting this in. Combining these law enforcement and bomb-detecting canine capabilities provides another layer of security at our airports. We have seen how the use of dogs helps us expedite our security lanes at SeaTac—now the busiest airport in the country as far as increase in volume—and we need to have more of these dogs outside on the perimeter as well. This will give us a visible deterrent and help us in protecting the much needed continuation of air transportation travel.

I also want to mention a couple of other things that are in this legislation—the checkpoint of the future and making sure we are streamlining our security checkpoints. We have been proud to work with the Pacific Northwest Lab in Richland, WA, where critical work is underway in detection technologies. And this legislation contains the extension of an important aviation safety item. There are 136 airports across the country that have automated weather equipment, but they need weather observers to make these around-the-clock observations. So at Spokane International Airport, this is a vital tool, and I was so glad to work with Senator MORAN and others in keeping this on.

Finally, we address in this extension a critical upcoming shortage of air traffic controllers by making improvements to the FAA's hiring process and creating a path forward for graduates like those at the Green River Community College in Washington State.

I thank Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON for these inclusions in their work. We obviously have much more work to do to maintain our aviation infrastructure, and I look forward to getting those done in the very near future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President I rise today to discuss the security, safety, and other air travel benefits included in the bipartisan aviation reform agreement that was negotiated with the House of Representatives.

Last week, Senator BILL NELSON, the ranking member on the Senate Commerce Committee, and I reached accord on a way forward with House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman BILL SHUSTER and Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO. Our agreement presents an opportunity for the Senate to break the pattern of short-term extensions for the Federal Aviation Administration that have not included any meaningful reform.

The aviation bill the Senate passed by a vote of 95 to 3 in April was a larger and, granted, more comprehensive bill than the agreement that came out of our negotiations with the House. It contained provisions added by Members in the Commerce Committee and on the Senate floor that we remain committed to enacting.

Nevertheless, we knew that certain safety and security reforms just couldn't wait until next year for the process to restart. When we looked at the ISIS attacks in airports in Brussels and Istanbul, as well as the downing of a Russian jetliner leaving Egypt, we knew there were meaningful reforms that could help efforts to prevent these kinds of attacks here in America, and so we acted.

To address the threat of an "insider" working at an airport helping terrorists, the aviation reform agreement now before the Senate enhances requirements and vetting for airport workers with access to secure areas. It expands the use of random and physical inspection of airport workers in secured areas and requires a review of perimeter security.

Responding to ISIS's demonstrated interest in targeting unsecured areas of airports, this aviation reform bill includes provisions to enhance the security presence of units that can include canines and other personnel in prescreening airport areas and increases preparedness for active shooter incidents.

Because some international airports abroad operating nonstop flights to U.S. airports lack the security equipment and expertise of U.S. and other state-of-the-art airports, the bill authorizes TSA to donate unneeded security equipment to foreign airports with direct flights to the United States, permits increased cooperation between U.S. officials and partner nations, and requires a new assessment of foreign cargo security programs.

This bill, which the House passed earlier this week, recognizes that long TSA lines aren't only an inconvenient delay for passengers trying to catch flights, but they can lead to large crowds in unsecured airport areas that create a target for terrorists. To address these lines, the bill includes the

TSA PreCheck Enhancement Act, which will help enroll more Americans in expedited security screening and reduce waits by vetting more passengers before they arrive to get them through checkpoints quickly.

Beyond question, safety and security needs drove the effort to finish this 14-month aviation reauthorization. The result, I can confidently say, ended up being the most significant airport security reform bill in over a decade. Our bipartisan, bicameral bill is good legislation that guards against the threat of terrorism, provides stability for the U.S. aviation system, and boosts safety and consumer protections for airline passengers.

As we prepare for a vote on this important bill, I urge my colleagues to support this bill that we carefully crafted over the past several months with our House counterparts that keeps the American people protected from terrorists, makes air travel safer and more secure, and addresses an issue of importance to all Americans.

Again, I thank the ranking member on our committee, Senator NELSON. Senators AYOTTE and CANTWELL, the chair and ranking member on the Aviation Subcommittee, were very involved in crafting this legislation. And, of course, there is the great work of our staffs, who put in countless hours to get us to where we are today, not only moving the original bill across the Senate floor back in April but also in negotiations with the House of Representatives to produce a result which I think we can all be proud of and which puts us on a path toward a safer travel opportunity for people in this country who use our airlines to get to their destinations.

Mr. President, I hope we will have a big vote, a bipartisan vote, in support of this bipartisan legislation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Ayotte	Flake	Murphy
Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Barrasso	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Gillibrand	Paul
Blumenthal	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Booker	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hirono	Rubio
Cantwell	Hoeben	Sanders
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cardin	Johnson	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Coats	King	Scott
Collins	Kirk	Shaheen
Coons	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	Markey	Udall
Daines	McCain	Vitter
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Ernst	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—4

Casey	Moran
Cassidy	Toomey

NOT VOTING—7

Cochran	Rounds	Wicker
Inhofe	Sessions	
Roberts	Shelby	

The motion was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 592; that there be 15 minutes of debate only on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Carla D. Hayden, of Maryland, to be Librarian of Congress for a term of ten years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Dr. Carla Hayden to be the head of the Library of Congress. President Obama nominated her on February 24, 2016, and the Rules Committee held a hearing on April 20, 2016.

I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, the Senator from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT, and Senator SCHUMER.

Why is there an urgency to confirm Dr. Hayden?

Speaking as the vice chair of appropriations committee, the Library of Congress has \$600 million of appropriations funded through the legislative branch and 3,000 employees. In addition to the work they do that is well known with the Library of Congress, they also oversee the U.S. Copyright Office for the entire Nation, which needs leadership and resources. The Library of Congress also needs to move into the digital age, and that is why President Obama nominated Dr. Carla Hayden.

As Senators from Maryland, Senator CARDIN and I know Dr. Hayden well. She has been head of the Maryland Enoch Pratt Free Library for 23 years. She is distinguished. She was the past president of the American Library Association and was confirmed by the Senate in 2010 to serve on the National Museum and Library Services Board and has received numerous awards.

She has proven herself to be a skilled manager of large, complex projects and handling large budgets. She moved the Enoch Pratt Free Library into the digital age by leading the renovation of IT infrastructure dating back to the 1930s. When she did that, she not only brought the library into the modern age, she avoided techno-boondoggles and produced tangible results.

She established a new wing dedicated to young adults, guided the \$11 million annex to house the library's oldest and rarest materials, and also made the library a statewide research institution. She is a transformational leader who receives kudos from community leaders, archivists, and academics.

President Obama has nominated a qualified candidate, and our Nation will be well served by her confirmation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the American Library Association and other information related to Dr. Hayden be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Library Association]
BROAD PUBLIC, LIBRARY AND EDUCATIONAL
SECTOR SUPPORT OF HAYDEN NOMINATION

MORE THAN 140 NATIONAL NONPROFIT AND LIBRARY GROUPS, SCHOOLS, AND ACADEMIC LIBRARIES URGE DR. CARLA HAYDEN'S RAPID CONFIRMATION AS LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, DC.—“The Library of Congress has never more needed the unique combination of character, acumen and humanity that Dr. Carla Hayden is so professionally, intellectually and personally qualified to offer that great institution. We urge her earliest possible approval by the Rules Committee and rapid confirmation by the Senate,” said more than 20 leading national nonprofit organizations in the letter below.

Nonprofit supporters were also joined by two dozen educational institutions (ranging from community colleges to the Big Ten and Ivy League); two dozen additional academic

libraries from every corner of the country; more than a score of national library groups; and virtually all of the nation's state library associations. Organized by the American Library Association (ALA), of which Dr. Hayden is a past-president, the letter was transmitted late yesterday to the members of the Senate Rules Committee which today holds its confirmation hearing on her nomination to become America's 14th Librarian of Congress.

ALA President Sari Feldman previously said of Dr. Hayden's nomination:

“The President could not have made a better choice. Hats off to President Obama for nominating Dr. Hayden, a professional librarian uniquely positioned with the leadership and management skills and understanding of digital technology to make the Library of Congress the preeminent national library in the world, highly-valued by and serving all Americans as a treasured resource. We look forward to working closely with her to further librarians' bedrock principle that all Americans everywhere deserve and must have equitable access to the information that they need to succeed and lead productive lives in the digital age.”

The 140+ group letter of support follows:
National organizations: American Booksellers Association, American Historical Association, Authors Alliance, Bill of Rights Defense Committee/Defending Dissent Foundation, Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, Center for Democracy and Technology, Constitutional Alliance, Electronic Frontier Foundation, Government Accountability Project, Harry Potter Alliance, National Coalition for Literacy, OpenTheGovernment.org, Organization for Transformative Works, PEN American Center, Public Knowledge, Reach Out and Read, Reading is Fundamental, Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC), Society of American Archivists, The OpenGov Foundation, The Sunlight Foundation

National Regional library organizations: National Association of Law Libraries, American Association of School Librarians, American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, Association for Library Collections & Technical Services, Association for Library Service to Children, Association for Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies, Association of Research Libraries, Association of Southeastern Research Libraries, Greater Western Library Alliance, Library Information Technology Association, Library Leadership & Management Association, New England Library Association, New Jersey Association of College and Research Libraries, Public Library Association, Reference and User Services Association, Southeastern Library Association, United for Libraries: Association of Trustees, Advocates, Friends and Foundations, Urban Libraries Council, Urban Librarians Unite, Young Adult Library Services Association

Educational institutions: Agnes Scott College (Atlanta), Appalachian State University (Boone, NC), Bates College (Lewiston, Maine), Clemson (SC) University Libraries, Dartmouth College (Hanover, NH), DePaul University (Chicago), Goucher College (Baltimore), Grand Valley State University (Allendale, Mich.), Illinois Wesleyan University (Bloomington, Ill.), Missouri State University (Springfield, Mo.), Northwestern University (Evanston, Ill.), The Pennsylvania State University (State College, Pa.), Rollins College (Winter Park, Fla.), St. Charles Community College (Cottleville, Mo.), Santa Clara University (Santa Clara, Calif.), Skidmore College (Saratoga Springs, N.Y.), Trinity University (San Antonio), University of Arkansas (Fayetteville, Ark.), University

of California, Los Angeles (Los Angeles), University of Colorado Boulder (Boulder, Colo.), University of Missouri-Kansas City (Kansas City, Mo.), The University of New Orleans, Utica (N.Y.) College, Wake Forest University (Winston-Salem, N.C.)

Academic libraries: Appalachian State University Libraries (Boone, N.C.), College of the Canyons Library (Santa Clarita, Calif.), Denison University Libraries (Granville, Ohio), Dominican University Graduate School of Library & Information Science (Lake Forest, Ill.), Duquesne University Gumberg Library (Pittsburgh), Florida State University Libraries (Tallahassee, Fla.), The Furman University Libraries (Greenville, S.C.), Georgia State University Library (Atlanta), Georgetown University Library (Washington, D.C.), Harvard Library (Cambridge, Mass), Ithaca (N.Y.) College Library, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries (Cambridge, Mass.), Michigan Academic Library Association, Montana State University Library (Bozeman, Mont.), Montgomery College Libraries (Rockville, Md.), Montgomery College Paul Peck Humanities Institute (Rockville, Md.), New York University Division of Libraries, Oregon State University Libraries and Press (Corvallis, Wash.), The Rockefeller University Rita and Frits Markus Library (New York), Rowan-Cabarrus Community College Learning Resource Centers (Salisbury, N.C.), Temple University Libraries (Philadelphia), University of Arizona Libraries (Tucson, Ariz.), University of California Council of University Librarians (11 campuses), University of Kansas Libraries (Lawrence, Kan.)

State library associations: Alabama Library Association, Alaska Library Association, Arizona Library Association, California Library Association, Colorado Library Association, Connecticut Library Association, Delaware Library Association, District of Columbia Library Association, Florida Library Association, Georgia Library Association, Hawaii Library Association, Idaho Library Association, Illinois Library Association, Indiana Library Association, Iowa Library Association, Kansas Library Association, Kentucky Library Association, Louisiana Library Association, Maine Library Association, Maryland Library Association, Massachusetts Library Association, Michigan Library Association, Minnesota Library Association, Mississippi Library Association, Missouri Library Association, Montana Library Association, Nebraska Library Association, Nevada Library Association, New Hampshire Library Association, New Jersey Library Association, New Mexico Library Association, New York Library Association, North Carolina Library Association, North Dakota Library Association, Ohio Library Association, Oklahoma Library Association, Oregon Library Association, Pennsylvania Library Association, Rhode Island Library Association, South Carolina Library Association, South Dakota Library Association, Tennessee Library Association, Texas Library Association, Utah Library Association, Vermont Library Association, Virginia Library Association, Washington Library Association, West Virginia Library Association, Wisconsin Library Association, Wyoming Library Association

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY CHAIRMAN ROY BLUNT FOR DR. CARLA HAYDEN, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS NOMINEE

QUALIFICATIONS

1. You led the Pratt Library amidst some very difficult circumstances. What about that experience has prepared you to lead the world's largest library?

Answer: For more than 20 years leading the Enoch Pratt Free Library, I ran a library

system that was the State of Maryland's research and reference library and an opportunity center for patrons of all ages and abilities. I witnessed how the Library made a significant impact on the lives of thousands of people, from researchers to job seekers.

During my tenure at the Pratt, the Library faced severe fiscal challenges, and transitions in management structures. At the same time, it strikingly became the main source of public computing for literacy and life empowerment. I led the Pratt Library as it redefined and refined its role as the research and reference library for the entire State of Maryland, providing internet service, staff training, public programs and digitization of collections. I enlisted substantial private and public support for the library, including major capital projects and technological improvements. My leadership required intense board and donor cultivation as well as cooperative work with all levels of government. As the primary advocate for the Library, I spoke to various constituencies, represented the institution in media, and made presentations on the needs of the Pratt Library to various stakeholders.

2. If confirmed, what goals and perspectives will you bring to the Library of Congress, and how will they advance the mission of the Library?

Answer: My primary goals for the Library of Congress are threefold: to ensure that it serves Congress at the highest level; to expand and enhance the reach of the Library's collections to innumerable settings throughout the country, including classrooms and public libraries; and to engage key stakeholders, including in the copyright community, to address how the Library can best meet their needs.

Should I be confirmed, my perspective and experience will assist the Library in meeting those goals in the following ways. As chief executive officer of a complex library system serving multiple constituencies with specialized services and collections, I know the importance of consensus building and strategic planning as vehicles to operate in a rapidly changing technological environment and profession. During my tenure at the Pratt Library, I also had the opportunity to serve on numerous civic and professional boards and to be elected President of the American Library Association (ALA) with a membership of over 63,000. These experiences, combined with my previous academic and professional tenures at the University of Pittsburgh School of Information Science and the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago, give me a broad outlook on managing change while preserving the traditions and legacy of venerable institutions and organizations.

MODERNIZING THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

3. Problems with the Library's information technology (IT) systems and management were well documented in a GAO audit released last year. The Library has already taken steps to address its IT deficiencies, but a lot of work remains. If confirmed, how will you continue the Library's efforts to improve and modernize its IT?

Answer: Modernized IT is the key to improving efficiency and access at the Library, and in its component parts, including the U.S. Copyright Office. I understand and will not lose sight of its importance. In over 20 years at the Pratt Library, I have overseen several IT modernization projects with an attention to detail that matched the significance of the project.

As the question notes, the Library is already making great strides in IT modernization. A new Library Chief Information Officer (CIO) was appointed in September 2015, and a Library-wide IT Strategic Plan was finalized in December 2015, demonstrating

that the Library is moving in the right direction. If confirmed, I look forward to executing and, where appropriate, strengthening that plan.

4. Please explain your efforts as CEO of the Pratt Library to improve access to digital resources, including computers and e-readers, and to expand that library's electronic collection.

Answer: One of my main priorities as CEO of the Pratt Library was to secure resources to enable the library to modernize its technological infrastructure not only in the City of Baltimore but for the entire State of Maryland. The Library serves as the State Library Resource Center. Accordingly, it is responsible for providing internet and reference services for library users across the state.

During my tenure, I led the effort to raise and secure public and private funding to build the internet service for libraries, school systems, and other government agencies in Maryland. In the City, we established an IT plan and unit to expand the Library's electronic collection by lending e-books and e-readers while enhancing broadband and computer access at all facilities. At present, the Pratt Library is the largest provider of public access computers in Baltimore. In fact, the Pratt Library was the first entity to utilize the city's broadband network for public access. Also as the State Library Resource Center, the Pratt Library maintains, coordinates and updates the digitization program of collections across the state.

5. Please explain how your experiences renovating and modernizing the Pratt Library would guide you in modernizing the Library of Congress and improving its IT infrastructure.

Answer: In my experiences at the Pratt Library I learned first-hand the value of building a leadership team of senior IT managers whose highest priority was the core mission of the organization. In addition, I learned that where I continuously stressed the importance of strong IT infrastructure to the organization, the team was responsive. If confirmed, I will take a similar approach at the Library, a task made simpler by the strides the Library has recently made in this area.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

6. The Copyright Office is also in the midst of an IT modernization effort. If confirmed, how do you plan to assist the Copyright Office in its effort? Would you advocate for keeping the Copyright Office's IT systems aligned with those of the Library, or are you open to giving the Office a degree of independence (and the necessary resources) to manage its own unique IT needs?

Answer: My goals for IT infrastructure at the Library generally, and the U.S. Copyright Office more specifically, are efficiency and effectiveness. I will approach the issue of whether the U.S. Copyright Office should have separate IT infrastructure with an open mind, and I will embrace the solution that is most efficient and effective. As I approach the issue, I will do so with an understanding that the U.S. Copyright Office has particularized technology needs, and has a weighty task in serving its important and diverse stakeholders.

7. Some have noted that the Copyright Office's registration process has become outdated, cumbersome, and backlogged, particularly for those operating in the digital space. What plans do you have to help the Register improve the copyright registration process so the Office can meet the needs of those industries at the core of the digital economy?

Answer: I understand that proposals are in place to address these concerns. If confirmed I look forward to working with the Library's

CIO and the Register of Copyrights to secure the necessary resources for implementation.

8. In your view what role should the Librarian of Congress play in shaping copyright policy and influencing the agenda of the Copyright Office?

Answer: By statute, the Librarian appoints and supports the Register as the chief administrator of the U.S. Copyright Office. In so doing, the Librarian relies on the significant subject matter expertise provided by the Register. If confirmed, I will carry out those responsibilities to ensure the U.S. Copyright Office has what it needs to function fully, effectively, and efficiently. In addition, if confirmed, I will be attentive to the views and concerns of stakeholders.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

9. If confirmed, what will you do to ensure that CRS fulfills its mission of providing to Congress authoritative, objective, nonpartisan legislative research and analysis? How would you respond to a Member's concerns that CRS has fallen short in this regard?

Answer: I believe the Library's Congressional Research Service staff are the "special forces" who are there to provide comprehensive and objective research to members of Congress. If confirmed, I would fully support the CRS mandate "to provide Congress, throughout the legislative process, comprehensive and reliable legislative research, analysis and information services that are confidential, objective, nonpartisan, authoritative, and timely, thereby contributing to an informed national legislature." If a Member concluded that CRS had fallen short of that mandate, I immediately would want to know how and why, and I would work with CRS to address the concern.

CHAIRMAN BLUNT QUESTION DURING HAYDEN NOMINATION HEARING RE: CHILD INTERNET PROTECTION ACT

Chairman Blunt. Thank you, Senator Boozman. I have a couple of other questions. Being the president of the American Library Association is, I am sure, a great honor, but maybe not an unmixed blessing, because suddenly you are responsible for everything that is being talked about as part of the association. There are a couple of areas of criticism that you and I have talked about and I would like to get your response to those on the record today. One was when the Congress passed the Children's Internet Protection Act, the American Library Association challenged the constitutionality of that, arguing that it violated the First Amendment. And I know, beginning then as a leader of the national organization through really up until now, you have commented on this several times, but you want to talk about that whole issue of what kind of violation that would have been, and then the issue of what kinds of things need to happen in a library to be sure that children do not have access to material that we would not want children to have access to, and then how often you have to revisit that whole concept?

Dr. Hayden. I really appreciate that question, Senator, because there has been quite a bit of just misinterpretation of the Library Association's position during that time. That was in 2003-2004, and at that time, the filters that would have been required for libraries to install were found to prohibit access to the very important health information, and the most notable at that time was breast cancer. And since that time, the technology has improved and the filters that are installed to receive federal funding—and my library, the Pratt Library, in its state role, has installed filters—have improved, and the need to be vigilant is also something that libraries are doing in not only the technological aspect, but just plain physical arrangements of computers, making sure that

there are faceout positioning of computer monitors, as well as very few, if any, cubicles that contain computers as well, and education and making sure that people know that pornography is illegal and we do not support that in any shape or form.

Chairman Blunt. You do not think that pornography, illegal, as you described it, has a place in the library?

Dr. Hayden. Not online, no.

Chairman Blunt. And there are, at the same time, things in the library that are not appropriate for everybody that visits the library to see.

Dr. Hayden. Right, and Senator, the way you described it is exactly the way that libraries even design their buildings and the furniture, and making sure there is even signage that unaccompanied adults in children's sections are going to be questioned. There are so many safety measures that are put in public libraries, and even college and university libraries, to make sure that minors are safe and that they are not exposed to objectionable material as far as we can prevent.

SENATOR CRUZ QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FOR DR. CARLA D. HAYDEN COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—NOMINATION TO BE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

1. The Library of Congress recently announced its decision to eliminate the terms "aliens" and "illegal aliens" from subject heading and search classifications, replacing them with the supposedly less "pejorative" terms "Noncitizens" and "Unauthorized immigration." Numerous important historical materials use the former terms. And at over 100 years of age, the heading "aliens" is one of the oldest headings used by the Library. Moreover, Congress has chosen to utilize these terms throughout the United States Code. The Library's decision to nevertheless move forward with this revisionist maneuver appears virtually unprecedented, and it will waste resources and hinder research efforts.

Do you believe the largest library in the world should be sacrificing research efficiency and resources in the name of political correctness?

Answer: The Library of Congress has a long history of (i) providing assistance to researchers in finding what they are looking for in its vast collections, and (ii) sharing its processes with libraries of all types throughout the nation. Part of the Library's process includes reviewing catalog subject headings, often at the request of the public or the library community. In fact I was involved in a similar review of the terms referring to African Americans, which evolved from Negro, Black, and Afro-Americans during extensive debate and discussion among numerous communities. In this current subject heading review, my understanding is that the Library is engaging in a customary public comment period and after the comments are received will engage in additional review regarding the matter.

Similarly, do you believe the exclusive research arm of Congress should be eliminating search terms used extensively by Congress in the United States Code?

Answer: I understand that the Library is reviewing this matter and will consider the most effective and efficient use of subject headings for research and reference for the public in searching the Library's collections, as well as those in libraries throughout the nation. This review will consider the needs and use of Congress, as the core mission of the Library is to assist Congress in performing its constitutional duties.

As Librarian of Congress, would you reverse this unprecedented and harmful action?

Answer: If confirmed, I would ensure that the responsibilities of the Policy and Standards Division of the Library, which responds to constituent request regarding catalog subject headings, are performed and carried out in the most professional, efficient, and objective manner. In the position of Librarian of Congress, I would welcome the opportunity to work with Congress to ensure that the Library's mandates are fulfilled.

Ms. MIKULSKI. In the interest of time, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, the library of Congress is at a critical juncture. We seldom talk about the Library because there have only been 13 Librarians who have served in the Library of Congress in the entire history of the Library, dating back to the starting of the Federal Government here in Washington. It is an important time for the Library to have a chance to really focus on the technologies available to us today.

I am the chairman of the Rules Committee, and the ranking Democrat on that committee, Senator SCHUMER, and I proposed legislation earlier in the year that would set a limit—for the first time—for the Library of Congress. This nomination is the first nomination for a Librarian to have a term limit. That 10-year term will replace what was previously a lifetime appointment.

It is a critically important 10 years for the Library. Congress unanimously agreed to make this change, and then the nomination of Dr. Carla Hayden was received by the Rules Committee at the end of February this year. Since that time, the committee has thoroughly vetted Dr. Hayden. We reviewed her qualifications, writings, experience, and in particular, her role in leading the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore for the past 23 years. She oversaw the expansion and modernization of the library and how it could be made more available to people.

This committee spent more time reviewing this nomination than any previous nomination for this position. I think she has an extraordinary professional background. By the way, the longest serving Librarian of Congress was a librarian, and she brings that skill in ways that nobody else has in the past. She earned her Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in library science. She served as an assistant professor at the University of Pittsburgh, and spent 40 years working in her chosen profession of leading library systems in Chicago and Baltimore.

She has been endorsed by librarians around the country, associations, and higher education entities in many States, including my State. Missouri State University and the University of Missouri in Kansas City have both endorsed her service. The librarian in Ferguson, MO, served on panels with her and has endorsed her. The libraries in both Ferguson and Baltimore played their own roles in dealing with the stress that those communities have faced over the last 2 years.

Dr. Hayden led the American Library Association from 2003 to 2004. This is the national organization for librarians. In 2001, before she began her tenure as President, the organization's council voted to challenge the Children's Internet Protection Act on First Amendment grounds. This act requires libraries receiving public funding to install Internet content filters on public computers. This requirement helps protect children from harmful Internet content in public libraries, and, of course, I support its implementation.

In 2003, right before Dr. Hayden became president of the association, the Supreme Court upheld the law, and she was actually the president of the association not when they challenged the law but when they implemented the law.

I specifically asked her about her position on the Children's Internet Protection Act during our public hearing on the nomination, and I wish to make a couple of points about her response to my questions. She explained to the committee that the American Library Association's concerns were focused on unintentionally restricting access to nonpornographic materials, including health information related topics like breast cancer. At the time, according to Dr. Hayden, the filters were not as sophisticated as they are today, and they had a tendency to overfilter in some areas. However, she made it clear that her view of pornography was that it has no place in public libraries and noted that her library, the Enoch Pratt library, has installed filters consistent with the requirement of the law.

I will quote her testimony at this point because this has been the one area where some Members have expressed concern. She said:

Technology has improved and the filters that are installed to receive federal funding . . . have improved. And, the need to be vigilant is also something that libraries are doing in not only the technological aspect, but just plain physical arrangement of computers, making sure that there are face-out positioning of computer monitors, as well as very few, if any, cubicles that contain computers as well, and education and making sure people know that pornography is illegal and we do not support that in any shape or form.

The committee went through a thorough process. She was unanimously approved by the committee. I certainly agree with Senator MIKULSKI when she said that this is an important time. We have taken the time to look at this, and we don't need to wait any longer.

I urge my colleagues to approve this nomination.

Mr. President, I also ask that Senator CARDIN have a chance to speak about Dr. Hayden. He also knows her very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator BLUNT for his leadership and for bringing this nomination to the floor. I wish also to thank Senator SCHUMER and the manner in which it

was handled by the Rules Committee. The staff did a lot of work, and I thank all who were involved in bringing this nomination forward.

We have heard from my colleagues, Senator MIKULSKI and Senator BLUNT, about the extraordinary qualifications of Dr. Hayden. She has the academic credentials, experience, and proven leadership, as we saw with the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore and what she was able to do.

I wish to add one more dimension to this, if I might, and that is the person she is. She is admired by all. She knows how to bring people together. She has incredible people skills in addition to having the technical skills to be an extraordinary CEO and to manage a complex operation. The Library of Congress is a complex operation. It takes a great deal of management skills.

She has received many acknowledgements and awards during her career, but the one that I think perhaps speaks to her character the most was when the Daily Record gave her the award for the most admired CEO 2 years ago. That is a hard award to get, and it just shows that she knows how to lead—but to lead in an effective way. Quite frankly, the Library of Congress, I think, will benefit from those skills and use those skills very effectively.

I also want to share with my colleagues that, in addition to her credentials in her profession, which we have already gone through—including being president of the American Library Association and also serving on the accreditation committee—she has done a lot of the nuts and bolts with regard to libraries both locally and nationally.

She has also been involved in many community activities. I know that locally she served on the Goucher College board, the Baltimore Gas and Electric board, and the Baltimore Leadership School for Young Women. I could mention a lot more activities. She has been an extremely engaged individual in our community.

I know she will do a great job in this capacity, and I know she will make us proud. We know the Library of Congress is the envy of the world, and I think we have a world-class leader to lead the Library of Congress. I urge my colleagues to support this confirmation.

If there is no one else who seeks recognition, I suggest that we yield back all time and move toward a vote.

Mr. BLUNT. I yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hayden nomination?

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Ex.]

YEAS—74

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Baldwin	Franken	Murphy
Barrasso	Gardner	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Booker	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Burr	Hoeven	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Shaheen
Capito	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	King	Sullivan
Carper	Klobuchar	Tester
Casey	Lankford	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Tillis
Cooms	Manchin	Toomey
Corker	Markey	Udall
Cornyn	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	McConnell	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—18

Cassidy	Ernst	Perdue
Coats	Heller	Risch
Cotton	Isakson	Rubio
Crapo	Kirk	Sasse
Cruz	Lee	Scott
Daines	McCain	Vitter

NOT VOTING—8

Cochran	Rounds	Shelby
Inhofe	Sanders	Wicker
Roberts	Sessions	

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 (Mr. CASSIDY). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to talk about the pace of judicial confirmations with my friends, the Senator from Hawaii and the Sen-

ator from Massachusetts, who have been real leaders on this issue.

Well, we have only one more day of legislative session before Congress breaks until September. It is an appropriate time to take stock of how the majority has handled their job of scheduling and confirming judges. More than a year into this new Congress, the Republican leadership has allowed only 22 judges to be confirmed—only 22. In the last 2 years of the Bush administration with a Democratic majority—the mirror situation of what we are in today—there were 68. So that is 68 versus 22.

The Republican majority is confirming judges at the slowest rate in more than 60 years. This has real consequences across America. Vacancies have risen from 43 to 83 since Republicans took over the majority; 29 have been judicial emergencies. I know that in my city of Buffalo in Western New York we had an emergency. We have one of the busiest courts, and for a while we had no judges. Now we have one.

At this point in time in the Bush administration, with Democrats in control of the Senate, we had reduced the number to 39. That is half as many vacancies as now exist. From the district courts to the Federal courts of appeal, all the way up to the Highest Court in the land, the Republican majority has been showing the American people that when it comes to judges, they just are not doing their job.

This is hardly a Senate that is back to work. The nuts and bolts of governing is the process of nominations, especially for the judiciary. By this measure, the Republican Senate and its Judiciary Committee are not back to work; they are sleeping on the job. There is no better example of it than the irresponsible, partisan blockade of President Obama's Supreme Court pick, now in its fifth month.

The speedy application of justice, the right to petition the government for redress of grievances is a bedrock of American values enshrined in the Constitution. This is not an abstract concept. It has real, everyday consequences for American litigants. Justice delayed is justice denied.

Without judges on the bench, justice is denied for a woman who was unjustly fired, suing to get back her job and support her family.

It is denied for a small business owner seeking to resolve a contract dispute and keep his stores open. Any small business owner can tell you that when lawsuits hang over them, whether they are plaintiffs or defendants, it causes them sleepless nights. My dad was a small business man. Our Republican colleagues are just twiddling their thumbs.

It is denied for criminal defendants who deserve to have their cases heard in a courtroom before an impartial judge and a jury of their peers. This matters in so many of the States, including my home State of New York.

One of the judges who has been languishing on the calendar is Gary Brown. He is currently serving as a magistrate judge in the Eastern District of New York. He has been nominated for a seat on the Islip court, a crowded bench. Long Island has 3 million people, more than many States. That seat has been vacant for 18 months—18 months.

The small business people in Long Island who need these cases settled and the many others who are awaiting justice are in anguish. Our Republican colleagues just sit there. We know why. The American people know why too. They are not doing their jobs.

Gary Brown is eminently qualified for this seat. As a magistrate judge, he heard a number of cases related to the fallout from Superstorm Sandy. Only through Judge Brown's intelligence and integrity were deficiencies in the insurance claims process uncovered, and hundreds of homeowners began to recoup their losses. So we need a Judge Brown. The people of Long Island need a Judge Brown. Without judges on the bench, we are diminishing that corps.

Our majority leader likes to talk about the fact that the Senate is working again. Give me a break. If you can't even appoint judges, how can you say the Senate is working? There is no good reason other than the usual political games, games that Democrats did not play when we were in the same position in the last 2 years of George Bush's term and we had the Senate majority.

Well, we have 1 day left before we break. Yet this body has failed to pass adequate legislation dealing with Zika, failed to pass real funding on the opioid crisis, failed to pass sensible gun safety measures after another senseless tragedy in Orlando, and failed to fill our benches, whether it is the Supreme Court, the circuit courts, or the district courts.

Our Republican majority owes it to the American people to make some progress on judges before Members run for the hills. We should not be adjourning with this many vacancies, this many judicial emergencies. It is time to confirm these uncontroversial nominees. I say to every one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly the majority leader, it is time to do your job.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 11, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 359, 362, 363, 364, 459, 460, 461, 505, 508, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 597, 598, 599, and 600; further, that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations; and that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I

will. I would like to put all this in perspective and talk about the theatrics that we sometimes call the discussion on the Senate floor. You know, I think that we have a tendency here—maybe it is because we are busy and we have got a lot of other things we are doing, but we have a tendency to have very short memories.

We should remember that we confirmed a judge last week and the prior week. In fact, one of those judges was a judge put forth, supported by Senators from the State of New Jersey, both Democrat Senators. We moved forward with the confirmation.

I also want to talk a little bit about history because I am new here. But my facts seem to stand in contrast to what is discussed on this floor from week to week. When it comes to judicial nominations, the President has been treated much more fairly, I would submit, than President George W. Bush. To date, the Senate has confirmed 329 of President Obama's judicial nominations. At this point, President Bush had only 312 judicial nominations confirmed.

In fact, President Obama has now surpassed President Bush in terms of the total judicial nominees confirmed for the entire Presidency of George W. Bush. During his entire Presidency, the Senate confirmed only 326 of President Bush's judicial nominations. We have already confirmed 329. So I would submit, that is getting the work done. That is getting the job done. That is doing our job.

I know the other side of the aisle does not like the fact that they don't set the floor agenda. But any reasonable, objective review of the record demonstrates that President Obama has been treated more fairly than his predecessor, George W. Bush.

So, for that reason, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, Donald Trump spent years pedaling Trump University, a sham college that his own former employees refer to as one big, fraudulent scheme. Now he is being sued for fraud and, worse, for targeting the most vulnerable people he could find, lying to them, taking all their money and then leaving them in debt.

Now, the judge presiding over Trump's case is Gonzalo Curiel, a former Federal prosecutor who has spent decades quietly serving his country, sometimes at great risk to his own life. The Republican Governor who first appointed him calls him an American hero, and he was confirmed with bipartisan support from the Senate.

Like all district court judges, Judge Curiel's work is not political so he is following the law in the Trump University case, but Donald Trump wants Judge Curiel to bend the law to suit Trump's own personal financial interests and Trump's very, very fragile ego.

A little over a month ago, Trump began savagely attacking the judge's

integrity and his Mexican-American heritage at political rallies. Some Republicans in Congress claimed to be shocked by the assault on our legal system. PAUL RYAN called Trump's attack the "textbook definition of a racist comment."

Oh, please. Spare me the false outrage. Where do you suppose Donald Trump got the idea that he can demean judges with impunity? He got it from Republicans right here in Congress.

It is bad enough that Senate Republicans will not even give Merrick Garland, the President's Supreme Court nominee, a hearing—while the Republicans' allies spend billions of dollars conducting a nonstop campaign of slime against him. But the story is actually much bigger than Judge Garland.

Sixteen noncontroversial district court judicial nominees—16—are waiting to take their seats alongside Judge Curiel on the Federal bench. They have been investigated, they have gone through hearings, and they have been voted out of committee. About half have been sitting there for more than a year.

But in a few days, the Republicans who control the Senate are planning to pack up and shut down this body for most of the rest of the year, leaving every single one of these men and women to twist in the wind. Why? Because in 6 months Donald Trump might be President. Make no mistake, Republicans want Donald Trump to appoint the next generation of judges. They want those judges to tilt the law in favor of big businesses and billionaires like Trump. They just want Donald Trump to stop being so vulgar and obvious about it.

It is ridiculous. If Republicans expect the American people to believe they don't agree with Trump's disgraceful attacks on an independent judiciary, they should confirm these judges.

We have just one message for the Republicans: Do your job—now—before shutting off the lights and leaving town. At least confirm the 13 noncontroversial district court judges who were nominated before 2016.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 359, 362, 363, 364, 459, 460, 461, 508, 569, 570, 571, 572, and 573; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements 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?

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Sometimes when I come to the Senate floor, I can't help but think that people who are watching me in the Gallery and watching on C-SPAN are thinking: What's going on? I thought we were working on funding the veterans, coming up with a solution to Zika, funding the DOD, making sure States and localities have adequate resources to combat drug addiction and the opioid epidemic. Instead, we get floor speeches that have nothing to do with doing our jobs.

I am doing my job today in objecting to these measures so we can actually get back to the pressing matters that hopefully will get passed out of the Senate before we go to the state work period and return in September.

Mr. President, for that reason, I object to the motion from the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I am not sure what version of the Constitution you are reading that doesn't say confirming judges is part of doing your job in the U.S. Senate.

These judges have all been completely vetted, they are noncontroversial, and they have bipartisan support. The amount of time it would take to get these judges confirmed is simply: Don't object. Let us go forward.

We hear a lot of talk these days from Republicans in Congress suddenly caring about the rule of law. Talk is cheap. Real cases are piling up. Real courts are starved for help. Real justice is being denied, and the American people aren't easily fooled. If Senate Republicans leave town without putting a single one of these highly qualified, noncontroversial judicial nominees on the bench, they are making it clear that for them politics is everything 24/7, that politics trumps everything, even an independent judiciary.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I thank Senators SCHUMER, WARREN, and others for their efforts to get some movement on these neglected judicial nominees. When we talk about the Senate doing its job, of course confirming judges is a part of the Senate's job. In fact, only the Senate can do that job.

So far 23 of the 24 nominees on the Executive Calendar were approved by the Judiciary Committee by voice vote, including 16 district court nominees. This includes Hawaii's own Clare Connors. Before I speak about Clare, I want to also mention that she and the other nominees before us today—who were unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee—will be kept from serving on the Federal bench, kept from doing those jobs because of Republican inaction.

I will tell you something about Clare. She has wide-ranging experience, in-

cluding district and appellate venues, criminal and civil arenas, and litigation on issues ranging from tax law to tough cases such as crimes against children.

I met with Clare in Hawaii and when she came before the Judiciary Committee. She is more than qualified to serve on the Federal bench today. Senator GRASSLEY has indicated that Republicans will shut down the nomination process this month, even though vacancies have nearly doubled.

If Clare is not confirmed, the Hawaii district court seat would be left vacant for a year. Historically, the Senate has held confirmation votes on widely supported nominees into September of a Presidential election year.

The nominees before us all have bipartisan support and come from States throughout the country: Tennessee, New Jersey, New York, California, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Utah, and of course Hawaii.

I urge my Republican colleagues to do their job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 359, 362, 363, 364, 459, 460, 461, and 508; further, that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements 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?

The Senator from North Carolina.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 2577

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

I wish to just touch briefly on what the distinguished Senator from Hawaii mentioned regarding vacancies. If you take a look at the average number of vacancies over the last 25 years or so, during every presidency, the average vacancy rate has been higher than it is in 2016. It is a natural part of the process that when judges move up to senior status, we are filling the vacancies. This goes up and down. This is not a crisis. It is no different than a situation the Senate has dealt with long before I got here.

Mr. President, so that we can dispense with these matters and move back onto the legislation before us that can fund the VA, that can address the Zika crisis and do things that we need to do before we get out of town, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I want to get back on doing my job. I promised the people of North Carolina I was going to help fund the VA.

That is why I am proud to be a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I told the soldiers down at Fort Bragg and Camp Lejeune and across this Nation we were going to work to fund the Department of Defense.

What I wish to do is see if we can get back to these matters that are necessary and important. They will save lives. They will equip our men and women to take the fight wherever we may go.

Today I want to talk specifically about the MILCON-VA-Zika bill that is before us. It is a conference report. For those who are not familiar with conference reports, they are unamendable. We need an up-or-down vote, and we need to send it to the President's desk.

That is what lies before us. That is a bill we can pass this year, funding that the Democratic conference in large numbers supported at \$1.1 billion when it went to the House.

What is that funding going to do? It is going to fund remediation programs to make sure we don't have an epidemic that is spread through mosquito bites. Right now, the known U.S. cases are all travel related, but we are afraid of that threat—particularly as mosquito season sets in across the Nation. It has been going on in North Carolina and the South for several months. We want to give local health professionals and the CDC the resources they need to find a vaccine that the CDC promises we can get in a matter of 18 months, and we want to make sure we do everything we can to educate people about the potential dangers of this disease. That is what approving this conference report will do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2577 and that the conference report be agreed to with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object, and I am going to say a few words.

I say to my friend, the junior Senator from North Carolina, this is the first time I have ever heard anyone say the problem with the judges is it is just one of those things, let's not worry about it, it happens all the time—but that is not true. Around America today, we have a number of extremely important judicial emergencies, meaning we have all these judicial districts where there are not enough judges to do the work.

Justice delayed is justice denied. Having practiced law quite a few years, it is very hard to go to a court and be told: We are sorry, but the judge is doing all civil cases today. He has no time for criminal cases—or vice versa.

So I appreciate his succinctness saying: Well, this is no big deal. Don't worry about the judges.

We are worried about the judges. It is very difficult.

Let's move on to the second subject he brought up, the second subject—judges are no big deal. I think that is a tremendously big deal and so do the American people.

Once again, the Senator from North Carolina seeks to pass the very partisan VA-Military Construction-Zika bill. Yes, he said—for those not familiar with the conference reports, I am familiar with lots of them. I have been through lots of conference reports. I understand the rules, but I also understand that we as a body can do anything we want to do. That is the way the Senate operates. We have the ability to change the rules in a manner of minutes and move on to change what is before this body. We know the reason the Republican leader cannot move forward on a Zika funding bill that is reasonable is because the House of Representatives is unreasonable.

We passed out of this body a very good bill. It wasn't what I wanted. I wanted \$1.9 billion that the Centers for Disease Control and the National Institutes of Health said they need—\$1.9 billion. But I said: OK, \$1.1 billion will help a tremendous amount. It is emergency spending, no offsets.

So we agreed and sent it to the House. Eighty-nine Senators voted for it. The Democrats voted for it and the vast majority of Republicans voted for it. That was good. It wasn't perfect, but it was good.

So what did the House of Representatives do? They filled this report, this conference report. They ignored what we had done in the Senate, and they decided they were going to stick some of their favorite poison pills onto this legislation. Why? Because the Speaker, to his credit, is trying—but he is not doing much good over there. He is finding that Speaker Boehner couldn't do much better than he has done. That is why Boehner left. He couldn't handle it because, as Boehner used to call them, the "crazies" take over that caucus.

They have a rule in the House, Mr. President—and the Presiding Officer used to serve in the House of Representatives. All the time he was there, they had this rule. When I was there, there was no such rule. The rule they have now is called the Hastert rule. Of course, Hastert is in prison, so they should at least change the name of that rule. The Hastert rule says: We are only going to pass a bill if we can get a majority of the majority to vote for it. So to get anything done in the House of Representatives, you have to have a majority of the Republicans support a bill. It doesn't matter how the Democrats feel. Basically, they do not get to vote on anything.

So what they did, in an effort to get something back here—the Speaker has told lots of people: I can't pass anything dealing with Zika unless we do something about Planned Parenthood. That is what he has told everybody, and it is obvious from what they sent us. So this \$1.1 billion, no offsets, came back to us as a—I don't know what to

call it. They are not the same two vehicles. It restricts funding for birth control provided by Planned Parenthood.

There is an obsession by the House Republicans—and I am sorry to say the obsession over here is fairly well fixed also—and they want to do everything they can to dramatically negatively affect Planned Parenthood. That is what this is about.

If you are a woman in America today and you are worried about Zika, I think you should be concerned about birth control. And women all over America are. Some women can't go to a boutique physician and get a prescription; they need to go to Planned Parenthood, where the health care needs of millions of women are taken care of—but not under Republican guidance, no.

So as part of this conference report, funding for Planned Parenthood would be restricted—birth control.

Just to make sure they covered all their poison pill areas, they said: We have to do something to whack the environment, so we will change the Clean Water Act. That is what they did. That is what we got back.

We hear all these great speeches about "We want to do something to take care of the veterans." Well, \$500 million was taken out of veterans to help pay for Zika funding—\$500 million. What was that veterans money to be used for? Processing claims. There is a tremendous backlog. But that is in there.

Ebola funding. Two years ago, America was up in arms over Ebola. The epidemic has died down, but it is not gone. There are still pockets of real problems in Africa, and on any one day, they could burgeon into something like they were 2 years ago. The National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control want to keep some money there so they can take care of this epidemic, but, no, they whacked \$107 million off of that.

Everyone knows the money they took from ObamaCare—I could raise a point of order right now and it would fall. They can't do that. That is wrong. They have had 67 votes in the House to defund ObamaCare. None of them have passed, but they have had fun trying.

But in a final effort to kind of stick their finger in our eye, they said: Here is what we are going to put on this great bill. We believe it would be appropriate to fly the Confederate flag in military cemeteries. You can't make up stuff like this. That is what they did.

We have repeatedly reached out to the Republicans to try to compromise, to reach a solution to the threat of Zika. Of course, if we work together, we have a chance to prevent babies from being born with these terrible birth defects. The Presiding Officer is a physician. I wasn't able to listen to all of his speech last evening, but I watched part of it. He had a picture of a little baby, and he was explaining about what Zika is all about.

We have reached out to Republicans to try to work something out. We can work together. Even now, when we can see just over the horizon the Republican convention starting on Monday, we can still do it before then. We need to work something out. We want to do that. I have tried.

I know what is going on in the House. They can't pass anything on their own unless they put this kind of stuff in it. All they would have to do on the bill that passed the Senate with 89 votes—if the Speaker would allow a vote in the House of Representatives, it would pass overwhelmingly. Democrats, with rare exception, would vote for it. It would get 98, 99 percent of the Democratic vote, and a few Republicans would vote for it. It would pass overwhelmingly. That is what should happen, but it can't.

I understand the Speaker is constrained by—he hasn't gone this far, at least publicly. Boehner publicly said he had to deal with his crazies. Speaker RYAN is dealing with the same crazies.

So I am going to ask unanimous consent to pass the same Zika legislation that passed this body with 89 votes. As I said, if the Speaker allowed a vote on this, it would pass.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 5243

So I ask whether the Senator from North Carolina would amend his request to this: I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5243; that all after the enacting clause be stricken; that the substitute amendment, which is the text of the Blunt-Murray amendment to provide \$1.1 billion in funding for Zika, be agreed to; that there be up to 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, with no intervening action or debate.

Finally, Mr. President, I would ask that everyone be reminded that we have had emergencies all over America. The Presiding Officer—I am sorry to keep referring to him, but this is the subject at hand. When his State had that terrible devastation with that terrible hurricane, we were there. We were there the next day, the next week, the next month, the next year, doing what we could to provide emergency funding for the beleaguered State of Louisiana. We did it because it was the right thing to do. It was an emergency. It was unpaid for. There were no offsets. We have done that with an earthquake in California and with a manmade fire in Texas. That is what we do. That is what emergencies are all about.

So I ask that my consent request that I have outlined be approved.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from North Carolina so modify his proposal?

Mr. TILLIS. No.

Mr. REID. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I guess the shake of the head takes care of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I will be very brief—sometimes when I hear these debates, they seem to be far-ranging and they are getting off the main subject.

The motion that is before us would basically unwind a carefully crafted compromise that could come crashing down if we don't move forward with this deal. What the minority leader has suggested takes us back to a process that takes days or weeks. We can't afford days or weeks; we need to get this done now.

The motion we should be considering—that the Senator from Nevada objected to—is the one that would get this to the President's desk. The Senator's request adds time, complexity, and most likely is going to suffer the same fate in the House, so for that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modification.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. REID. I have objected to his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

SENTENCE REFORM AND CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I would like to give a few remarks about how I first became involved in the cause of sentencing reform within our Federal criminal justice system.

I will never forget when I first began to appreciate the full magnitude of this problem—the problem we face within a Federal criminal justice system that is sometimes too inflexible and sometimes doesn't allow judges to take into account the unique circumstances of each case. It was 2004. I was a Federal prosecutor, an assistant U.S. attorney in Utah. In some cases, I witnessed judges being forced by Federal law to impose punishments that simply, under any standard, did not fit the crime—first-time offenders sometimes being locked up for periods of time longer than some rapists or murderers, terrorists or kidnappers. These were real people—people with children, siblings, parents, spouses, and, of course, dreams for a better life. Yet in too many cases the so-called system that was supposed to correct their mistakes arguably compounded them. This system wasn't just wasting money, it wasn't just wasting physical material resources, it was wasting lives.

I know some in my party may view this as a progressive cause. I view it as a conservative one. Think about it. When there is a major problem tearing at our economy and our civil society—a problem that is threatening our most vulnerable families in our communities—conservatives don't just shrug their shoulders and expect a bunch of outdated laws and bloated government bureaucracies to take care of it. We know better. Criminal justice reform doesn't call on conservatives to aban-

don their principles, it calls on them to fight for them.

This process and the conservative cause are all about making our communities—these little platoons, if you will, of service and cooperation at the very heart of our constitutional republic—safe and prosperous and happy. It is about basing our laws and basing our court procedures and our prison systems on a clear-eyed understanding of human nature—of how human beings respond, what brings out their better selves and what doesn't, about man's predilection toward sin and his capacity for redemption—along with an uncompromising commitment to human dignity.

Respect for the dignity of all human life, the basic dignity of the human soul, no matter how small or how weak, how rich or how poor, and the redemptive capacity of all sinners, no matter how callous, are the foundation for everything that conservatives purport to stand for. Our approach to policing and of punishment should be no different.

Moreover, as a conservative, I believe we ought to watch out anytime we give the government extraordinary powers, especially powers that deprive the individual of liberty. And nowhere is the deprivation of liberty more severe, more intense, more long-lasting than the deprivation of liberty that occurs when a person is locked up for years or for decades at a time, with no opportunity to progress, no opportunity to interact with family members, no opportunity to interact with the vibrant growing economy.

So when I got to the Senate and I was assigned to the Senate Judiciary Committee, I started looking for partners—partners on both sides of the aisle—who shared my concerns with the Federal criminal justice system, shared my concerns with the way Federal minimum mandatory sentences were working. I started looking for partners on both sides of the aisle who shared this commitment to reform. Progress in this area is difficult, and for a long time the progress we made in this area was slow, just as any deliberative process often is.

I found an ally in my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois. We teamed up and put together legislation. That legislation gradually started gaining some support. At first, it gained more support on the other side of the aisle than it did on my side of the aisle, but we were pleased with the progress that was made. But in the fall of last year, we struck an agreement and we started making more progress. We introduced a bill called the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act. Like most legislative compromises, it isn't perfect and it doesn't accomplish everything that every member of our coalition might wish we could accomplish, but it is an extraordinarily great start, and it proves it is possible to design our laws in a way that can balance the sometimes competing interests of

retribution and rehabilitation, justice and mercy, the rights of victims and the rights of perpetrators.

The Sentence Reform and Corrections Act will expand the now-limited discretion of Federal judges so they can treat offenders like human beings and not mere statistics and punish them according to their particular circumstances. It would broaden the Federal safety valve, a provision of existing law that allows judges to sentence a limited number of offenders below the mandatory minimum. Contrary to what many of this bill's critics claim, this would not absolve offenders of their crimes, nor would it suddenly and indiscriminately release legions of violent predators into our communities. In fact, under this reform, the status of violent offenders would not change at all. They would remain ineligible for Federal safety-valve relief.

Our criminal justice system simply has to be flexible—at least flexible enough—to apply in many different situations. Prosecutors and judges need to have the ability to impose lengthy sentences on serious offenders who pose the greatest threat to public safety, just as they must have the ability to impose modest sentences on those who violate our laws but do not pose an ongoing threat to public safety. Whenever we interfere with the flexibility of either of these, we impair the effectiveness and the efficiency of our Federal criminal justice system. When we do that, we necessarily make our country less safe, rather than more safe.

So this bill would leave untouched the maximum penalty levels that exist under current law. It also would not eliminate any mandatory minimum sentences. Instead, it takes a targeted approach, reducing the harshest mandatory penalties and providing relief for low-level offenders with limited criminal history. It is this type of offender that helped draw my attention to this issue back in 2004, just as I described a few minutes ago.

One of the cases that was being handled by the office in which I worked, the Office of the U.S. Attorney for the District of Utah, involved a young man named Weldon Angelos, a young man in his midtwenties, the father of two young children. He got involved in some criminal activity and was caught selling three relatively small quantities—dime-bag quantities—of marijuana to what turned out to be an informant. Because Mr. Angelos had a gun on his person at the time of these transactions, because of the way he was charged, and because of the way some of these provisions of law have been interpreted—including a provision of law in 18 USC, section 924(c)—Mr. Angelos received a sentence of 55 years in prison.

Now, we may ask: What on Earth was this judge thinking? How could such a judge be so cruel, so arbitrary, so capricious as to sentence this young man to 55 years in prison for selling three dime-bag quantities of marijuana? The

judge didn't have a choice. In fact, it was the judge who first drew my attention to the case because it was the judge who took the unusual—the almost unprecedented, almost unheard of—step of issuing a written opinion prior to the issuance of the sentence, disagreeing with the sentence the judge himself was about to impose.

Then-Federal district judge Paul Cassell issued a lengthy opinion stating: This is a problem. This young man is about to receive a sentence that is excessive under any standard. It is a longer sentence than he would have received had he engaged in many acts of terrorism or kidnapping. So why are we sending this guy away until he is about 80 years old simply because of this minimum mandatory penalty? But, the judge said: This is a problem I cannot address. This is a problem I am powerless to remedy. Only Congress can fix this problem.

Those words have haunted me ever since then: Only Congress can fix this problem. So when I became a Senator in 2011, I still remembered those words. Those words continued to haunt me and continue to haunt me to this day.

Miraculously, fortunately, Mr. Angelos has been released through a variety of procedural maneuvers that I don't have time to address right now. He himself has been released. Many others are still in prison, under the same system, who have been locked up for years—decades—at a time, much longer than any reasonable person would think would be a just sentence. In fact, I have yet to meet a single person—Democrat, Republican, old, young, male, female—who believes that the sentence Mr. Angelos received was just. His story, his example is a good reason why we need to pass this bill.

Finally, this bill improves the quality of our Federal prisons. If it became law, it would increase access to vocational training, therapeutic counseling, reentry services, and other programs, so that we would have fewer first-time offenders turning into career criminals.

All of these are commonsense and, I believe, long-overdue reforms. But make no mistake. We are at the beginning, not the end, of this generation's story of criminal justice reform. As all of us know, the road to reform is long and full of setbacks and obstacles. Today's movement for criminal justice reform is no exception. But so long as the people here today are involved in this effort, I am confident we can together succeed where our prisons today often fail—in preparing offenders to reintegrate into their communities as productive and law-abiding citizens, as spouses, parents, neighbors, and employees, instead of career criminals.

We can fix this problem. This bill would begin to address this problem. But we need to bring this up. We need to have the opportunity to debate this, to discuss this, to vote on it, and to pass it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Senator BOOKER from New Jersey is on the floor. The three of us asked to come to the floor at 3, because the rollcall was delayed.

I ask unanimous consent, if it is all right with the Senator from Ohio, that Senator BOOKER be allowed to follow and to complete his statement on the legislation we are supporting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am going to be brief because I want to defer and give my time to the Senator from New Jersey.

We are going through a moment in America's history that we are going to remember for a long time. We are used to shooting deaths. Sadly, gun violence has become part of America. Unfortunately, we are also used to mass murders, where more than four people are killed in one of these shooting incidents. But it rocked America's conscience and soul when five policemen from Dallas were murdered. Those five policemen were Officer Brent Thompson, age 43; Officer Patrick Zamarripa, age 32; Officer Mike Krol, age 40; Senior Corporal Lorne Ahrens, age 48; and Sergeant Michael Smith, age 55.

Yesterday, President Obama and former President Bush were there for the memorial service to honor these men and to honor everyone in law enforcement who gets up each morning, puts on a badge, and risks their lives for us—for me, for my family, for my neighbors, for my community, for my town, for my State, and for my Nation.

America was rocked by the senseless murder that took place in Dallas, TX. But it isn't the only thing that has stunned the conscience of America. At the same time, we have seen some shocking and disturbing videos. In Baton Rouge, LA—the home State of the Presiding Officer—Alton Sterling, a 37-year-old father, was shot and killed outside a convenience store. In Falcon Heights, MN, Philando Castile, age 32, was fatally shot in his car during a police traffic stop for a broken taillight. His fiancée and her 4-year-old daughter were in the car.

Those three events came together—the killings of the police in Dallas, and these video shootings—and shocked the conscience of America in a way that I haven't seen before. It really called into question some basics about our country and where we are going and what we need to do.

President Obama said we must try to find common ground when he spoke at this memorial service. He is right. I thought about that over the weekend, and I called my colleague and friend from New Jersey and talked to him about it. I said to him: When it comes to really showing America, and particularly those who feel aggrieved by the current State of justice, our bill on criminal justice reform speaks to a fundamental issue as to whether or not minority populations—people of

color—are treated fairly in our system of justice.

Senator LEE just spoke. For those who may not know him, Senator LEE is a conservative—a tea party conservative, I believe he would probably say—Republican from the State of Utah. Senator LEE is joining us—DURBIN of Illinois, BOOKER of New Jersey, and Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa—in this effort. How many times do we run into that, where four Senators with such diverse political beliefs come together on one bill—this bill? As Senator LEE explained, what we are setting out to do here is to right an injustice—an injustice that is filling the Federal prisons, sentencing individuals to lengthy sentences for nonviolent, nongun drug offenses.

This is long overdue, and it is something that we need to do. If we did it, it would say yes to those across America who are asking: Is Congress listening? Is the Senate awake to what is going on in our country? It would say to them: Yes.

On a bipartisan basis, these four Senators, and many more, are prepared to bring reform to our criminal justice correction and sentencing system. Will it solve all of our problems? No, not at all, but it is a significant step forward.

I was serving in the U.S. House of Representatives over 25 years ago when a famous basketball star at the University of Maryland died from a drug overdose. We were shocked by this. They came in and said it is possible that he was a victim of crack cocaine. We had never heard the term before. What is crack cocaine? A new form of cocaine crystals that are cheap, highly addictive, and destructive. Len Bias was his name. We were asked to put into law a sentencing provision that would be a warning to everyone across America: Don't use crack cocaine.

We did. We imposed a new sentencing guideline for crack cocaine 100 times the penalty over powder cocaine—100 times. What it meant, sadly, over a span of 25 years is that hundreds, if not thousands, of individuals were convicted of possessing and selling crack cocaine and sentenced for extraordinarily long sentences.

I ran into one of them in the city of Chicago. Let me tell a story. It is brief, but it tells a story.

Alton Mills, age 24 in 1994, was a runner, a seller when it came to street drugs. He was caught on his third offense of selling street drugs. His third offense. He had never served a day in jail, not one. His two previous offenses ended up in probation, and he didn't end up with any correctional time. But this third one was the third strike. It turned out that Alton Mills at age 24, for his third sale of crack cocaine, was sentenced to life in prison—life in prison.

He languished there. Thank goodness, his mom and dad never gave up on him. He found a public defender, whose name, ironically, was MiAngel Cody. She went to work and fought for

him and took her message to every office, including mine, and I took her message to the White House. Alton Mills' sentence was commuted. He came out of prison after 22 years behind bars. That is one example—22 years.

What we are trying to do is come up with a sentencing system that is sensible, that punishes those who are guilty for sure, but does it in a smart and thoughtful way—reforming and saying to populations across America, yes, we can be a more just society.

This criminal justice reform idea is one that is not only bipartisan, but it passed out of the Senate Judiciary Committee in October of last year—October—by a vote of 15 to 5. It was a bipartisan rollcall vote that came out of committee. Why haven't we taken up this bill? Why don't we take this up as soon as we return in September? Why don't we say to people across America that we are going to do something positive in terms of restoring justice in this country to everyone across the board in this bipartisan bill?

That is why we come to the floor today, and that is what we are asking for. It will save money for taxpayers in addition to bringing justice to the system. I believe the money we save can be brought back to our law enforcement agencies for training and equipment. So let's show our faith in their efforts to keep America safe, and let's show our commitment to justice in this reform.

I am fortunate because I was joined in this struggle by a brand-new Senator from New Jersey then named CORY BOOKER. He has been an extraordinary voice in this effort.

Senator LEE and I were doing pretty well until CORY BOOKER came along, and he has added more firepower and more horsepower to this effort than any other Senator could, certainly any new Senator. I commend him for helping us in this effort and being committed to it in his heart.

At this time I would like to yield the floor to my junior colleague from the State of New Jersey, Senator BOOKER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I want to thank MIKE LEE for coming to the floor and speaking with such heart and conviction. Also, I want to thank Senator DURBIN for his stand on the floor today.

Please understand, Senator LEE, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator DURBIN, Senator LEAHY, and so many Senators on both sides of the aisle have been speaking on this issue for years. In fact, since before I became a U.S. Senator, this moment has come. As Senator DURBIN began talking about the issues of the day, where there is so much frustration, so much concern, so much consternation, so much divisiveness on this issue of criminal justice in America, it made me think personally about this idea of hope because this week I have talked to a lot of people who seem

to be indulging in a dangerous, toxic state of being, which is hopelessness about criminal justice issues in our country.

I have appreciated Senator DURBIN, who has not just been a senior Senator, not just been steadfast in working on this issue, but he has been a friend, calling me up, not just this past week but weeks before, when lots of Americans were indulging in hopelessness about the divisiveness in our country, about the injustices in our country, about the ravages of a broken criminal justice system.

As I have been thinking about hopelessness, I keep coming back to this understanding, taught to me by teachers on the streets of Newark, NJ, that hope does not exist in an abstract; that hope is the active conviction that no matter how bad things get, despair will not have the last word; that hope is a choice that must be made amidst hopelessness; that amidst despair, amidst frustration, you have to choose hope; and that choosing hope means you commit yourself to a process that doesn't divide this country but that unifies it with the conviction that we can be a nation that makes real the words we pledge when we say we are a nation, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

This week we need those words. We need that hope. MIKE LEE and DICK DURBIN, two politicians on opposite sides of the spectrum, said: Hey, this is a time that we should be pushing hope, indivisibility, and we have a bill that addresses issues at the core of so much of the frustration going on. It doesn't solve all the issues, it doesn't wave a wand, but it will advance us toward liberty and justice for all because, unequivocally, we have gone off the rails.

Since 1980, the land of the free broke with the rest of the world and became the incarceration nation. Our prison population has exploded since 1980. The Federal prison population is up 800 percent. Our overall prison population is up 500 percent. We have only about 5 percent of the globe's population, but one out of every four incarcerated people on the planet Earth are right here in America.

In response to a criminal justice system that has lost its proportionality in its punishment and that seems to have become more about retribution than restorative justice, a criminal justice system that is rife with the stories that MIKE LEE talked about when he talked about Weldon Angelos and a judge who himself cried out about the injustice of sentencing someone to 55 years for a nonviolent drug crime or Alton Mills, whom Senator DURBIN spoke about, who was sentenced to life in prison for a nonviolent drug crime, we in America went off the rails.

I am hopeful today because on the right and the left, not just Members of this body but from the Koch brothers to Newt Gingrich, to Grover Norquist, to the ACLU, people on both sides of the political spectrum said we can do

better because this broken criminal justice system is hurting us. Rather than being a tool for public safety and social order, as was intended by our criminal justice system, it instead became an industry and an end to itself. It became a massive exploding bureaucracy, draining our economic prosperity.

In fact, one study has shown we would have 20 percent less poverty in America if our incarceration rates were similar to our industrial peers. This has been a divisive drain on our cohesive society, a misappropriation of taxpayer funds.

While our infrastructure has been crumbling, we have led the planet Earth in building out a prison infrastructure. In fact, between the time I was in law school in the mid-1990s to the time I became mayor of Newark, we were building a new prison in this country every 10 days.

Congress has increased Federal spending on prisons alone by 45 percent since about the year 2000. Congress has cut spending on the things that keep us safe, such as law enforcement at the State level, by 76 percent—putting someone like Weldon Angelos in prison for 55 years, hundreds of thousands of dollars in a long, disproportionate sentence for a nonviolent crime that could have gone to public safety, like hiring police officers for our community. What is painful to me in this time is that our criminal justice system—the data that I gave would be painful enough, but our criminal justice system clearly disproportionately affects poor people, leading authors like Bryan Stevenson to say that we have a criminal justice system that seems to treat you better if you are rich and guilty than poor and innocent.

Blacks and Whites have no difference in America in using or selling drugs, but African Americans are about 3.6 times more likely to get arrested for selling drugs. Instead of a criminal justice system that unites us under principles of justice and fairness, we see it disproportionately persecuting groups because they are poor or because they are of color.

If you look at Latinos, they account for the largest group of offenders convicted of offenses that have a mandatory minimum at 38 percent. Native Americans are grossly overrepresented in the criminal justice system with an incarceration rate 38 percent higher than the national average.

Eighty percent of Americans in our criminal justice system are represented by public defenders, meaning that they are deemed by the court to be indigent, to be too poor to afford an attorney.

Our justice system does not reflect our values. This drug war is not being carried out in a way that is fair or just, and it is not just hurting the poor, the mentally ill, the drug addicted, the minorities. It hurts all Americans because it drains our resources; it drains our treasure. When I say "treasure," I

don't just mean money. We have come to a point in America today where millions of children have had parents who are incarcerated, and it hurts generationally the best of our Nation, the promise of our Nation.

The irony about our lack of action in putting this bill to a vote is that States are already moving more quickly than we are. Red States, Georgia and Mississippi and Texas, have been doing things for years that we have been proposing in this bill, and have yet to enact, that have shrunk their prison populations. Guess what has happened in States such as Texas and Georgia and Mississippi, which have lowered their prison populations. Guess what happened. Their crime went down, as well, because when you have a system that is not about retribution but about restorative justice, that has proportionality in sentences, you not only save money for your State, but you also empower people to succeed and lower crime.

When States start to put drug addicts in treatment as opposed to jail, it empowers people to succeed, saves money, and lowers the prison population. It is common sense. Red states have acted. We have seen the success. But in the Federal prison population, there is an 800 percent increase. It takes away money that should be spent on homeland security, money that should be spent on investing in public safety, money that should be spent for our public universities, money that should be saved for the taxpayers but is now going, still fueling one of the biggest growing bureaucracies we have seen in the last 40 years.

This calls for unity in our country. I tell you, we have unity. When I can stand in partnership with MIKE LEE and CHUCK GRASSLEY, when you have people like PATRICK LEAHY and DICK DURBIN—these folks are not normally mentioned together as partners on legislation, but I am proud that some of the most esteemed Members, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, both agree that we can put more justice in our justice system. We can do something to reverse this trend, and we can begin to put rationality back so that the values of this country are made more real.

I am proud to have negotiated and worked with Chairman GRASSLEY, who is sitting across the aisle from me right now. I am honored. In the 3 years I have been in the Senate, one of the more proud things that I have accomplished is to find common ground with my Republican colleagues on the other side in a bill that I know—from the neighborhood and block that I live on to across the country—would make a difference.

Now we have encountered some sclerosis, some blockage. A dam exists between where we stand now and greater justice for our Nation. This has been a tough week. It has been a week of frustration and grief and sadness. This is a

time that we should choose hope. It is a time that we should choose unity. It is a time that this very body should be saying to America: Hey, we have challenges, but we can find common ground. We can come together, left and right, Black and White. We can do better than we are doing now. It is a hard walk that we have ahead, but this body can start leading on issues of justice.

There have been other difficult times in our country when this body answered the call. There have been times where people were fearful, people doubted, and there have been times where people felt their heart was heavy. I am proud that, in our history, it was in those times that leaders emerged and chose hope.

My prayer is that in the waning days of this Congress, with all the important things we have on our agenda, we remember that there are people right now who are stuck in despair. There are people who don't believe in our indivisibility, as we say in our Pledge of Allegiance. There are people who are frustrated. It is my hope, when it comes to issues of criminal justice, a system that is so obviously broken, that we choose reform; that we choose healing; that we demonstrate unity; that on this issue we bring forward a bipartisan bill that begins to cast away some of the darkness that hangs over our country with the light and wisdom that is in this bill that reflects both sides of the political aisle and, I believe, that reflects the best of who we are as a body.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise because I continue to believe that the Senate should take up the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act. There is still time this year for both the Senate and the other body to pass legislation reforming sentencing. In light of recent and justified public concern over treatment of suspects by some police and treatment of police by people who would do them harm, the need for the bill is even greater.

The Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act contains three parts, each of which was formed as the basis of a bipartisan compromise among Judiciary Committee members, as well as members off the Committee.

The first is a reduction in the mandatory minimum sentences for non-violent drug offenders. The bill takes great pains to limit sentencing reductions to people with minimal criminal histories and no history of serious violence. Second, the bill enhances prison programming that has been proven to reduce the likelihood of reoffending, and reduces the sentences of inmates who successfully completed those programs. Reducing the likelihood of future crimes reduces the crime rate. And third, the bill makes various reforms to the federal criminal justice system. For instance, it allows people convicted of certain crimes as juveniles

to expunge their criminal records if they turn their lives around. And it remedies a constitutional defect in Federal criminal law by permitting individuals sentenced to life sentences as juveniles to seek parole after many years, but doesn't guarantee that parole will be granted. It even adds two new mandatory minimum sentences to the Federal criminal code for serious crimes.

The confidence of people in the criminal justice system is not as strong as we would like. There are various reasons for this lack of trust, and some of them are valid.

The Judiciary Committee reported a compromise bill that is designed to address some of those concerns. The sponsors' willingness to compromise was further demonstrated by a managers' amendment that narrowed the bill's sentencing reductions.

Those changes responded to concerns of some of my Republican colleagues and brought on board a number of new Republican cosponsors.

I have been willing for a long time to enter into an agreement where members can offer amendments of various kinds and we can vote. For instance, the House has determined that a provision of substantive criminal law addressing intent should be part of any bill. I have been open to any compromise on that issue that could gain 60 votes. And I would agree to have a vote on the subject if a compromise cannot be reached. The differences can be aired and resolved.

I am certain that this bill would receive many more than 60 votes and that most of the Republican conference would vote for it if given the chance.

No one thinks the sentencing bill is perfect, as it represents a compromise among people with strong differences of opinion. But the people of this country want action to address deficiencies in the criminal justice system.

This bill would make important but limited changes in the way the Federal Government sentences those who commit crimes.

We should take the bill up, debate it, and show the American people that we are willing to take on one of the most important domestic challenges facing the country.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. We had a good vote earlier today on proceeding to that legislation, and it is my expectation and hope that we will vote on this legislation either today or tomorrow morning.

Let me say first say, this legislation called CARA, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, also includes some criminal justice reform. It is one step closer to this broader bill that Senator GRASSLEY and Senator BOOKER just talked about. I am a cosponsor of their bill because I do think we need sentencing reform, but CARA actually

has some reforms called diversion programs. Instead of putting people who are in the criminal justice system and addicted to drugs in prison, they are put into a treatment program, and those treatment programs have proven to be successful. We have drug court funding and specific new programs for our veterans. The notion is, this is part of criminal justice reform, to actually take people who are suffering from drug addiction in the criminal justice system and move them into treatment, which makes so much more sense for them, their families, taxpayers, their communities. That is part of this underlying legislation that we will vote on later today in the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act.

I also support broader legislation. I am hoping the broader legislation will have more to do with the prisoner re-entry programs as well—the so-called second chance. I am the author of the Second Chance Act from my House days, and I hope that legislation can be reauthorized as part of this larger criminal justice reform issue.

Today I will focus on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act because this legislation is badly needed. It is an emergency in our communities right now. This is the heroin and prescription drug issue that unfortunately many more people are learning about because it is affecting many more of us.

I had a tele-townhall meeting last night, which I do monthly. We had 25,000 Ohioans on the call. We typically have a few polls where we ask about the top issues. Last night, we asked how many people on the call were directly affected by the heroin and prescription drug issue. We asked people to indicate that by hitting “1” for a yes and “2” for a no. Sixty-eight percent of the people on this call said: Yes, they were directly affected. We had a lot of calls from people who were affected. We had a call from a woman whose stepson was addicted and he was trying to get treatment but couldn’t find a place, and they wanted me to help them find a proper place to get treatment and recovery services. Others called in about the legislation and asked why we haven’t passed it yet. My answer to them was, it is coming and help is on the way.

I am frustrated, just as they are, that we haven’t moved more quickly on this, but, again, we finally had a vote today to move this legislation forward. I hope the final passage vote will occur later today or tomorrow morning, and we will be able to get this to the President’s desk for his signature.

It initially passed the Senate with a 94-to-1 vote back on March 10. It then went over to the House of Representatives, where the House worked through their own process. They had 18 separate bills rather than 1 comprehensive bill, and then in the period between then and now, we have had this conference between the House and Senate to work out the differences. That conference re-

port was voted on in the House last Friday, and it was an overwhelming vote. Why? Because this makes so much sense. Again, on the Senate floor today we had a very strong vote result of 90 to 2 on the cloture motion to move this legislation forward, and I am hopeful we will have a strong vote tomorrow morning so we can send this to the President and get it to our communities and begin to get those who need it some help.

The legislation is considered by some to be inadequate because it doesn’t have enough funding in it. Well, it is not a funding bill. It is not an appropriations bill. It is a bill that establishes new programs to fund new and better ways to deal with addiction. It authorizes significant new spending. Since the Senate passed the bill with a 94-to-1 vote, only two things have happened with regard to funding. One is that we more than doubled the authorization so there is more funding authorized—\$181 million per year. Second, we also had the Appropriations Committee go through its process and both the Senate and House Appropriations Committee voted to actively increase funding in this area, and that is a good thing.

I think it is an emergency, I think it is urgent, and I think we should spend more money here because it will save money over the long haul and because there are so many people who are not achieving their God-given purpose because this addiction has taken them off track. We have to help them and help them now. We have to help keep people from getting into that funnel of addiction by focusing more on prevention and education, but all that has happened since the 94-to-1 vote in the Senate is that there has been a 93-percent increase over last year’s funding which will go into effect next year, and by the way that is a 539-percent increase over the funding just 2 years ago.

The House appropriations bill has a bigger increase in the funding. I will fight for that funding, and I will fight to ensure that that funding actually applies to the programs that are in the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act because it is the kind of legislation that will actually make a difference helping to ensure that we can begin to turn the tide on this issue.

The legislation before us is one that 94 Senators have already voted for, and, again, it passed the House with big numbers so I am hopeful there will not be any roadblocks in the way of getting it done.

Today I was asked by some people: What does the bill really do? I started to go through all of the specific grant programs for our veterans, mothers who are pregnant, kids who are born dependent on drugs, and those folks who find themselves unable to get treatment. There are specific provisions for our law enforcement personnel, which is why the Fraternal Order of Police has been a strong supporter. I appreciate them for standing

up early as a law enforcement entity. Others have backed this legislation as well because it provides more training on how to use this miracle drug called Narcan, or naloxone, which will help save people who have overdosed. There are a lot of specific programs here, but I think the answer to the question as to what it does is pretty simple. For the first time ever in this United States Congress, it begins to treat addiction like the disease it is, and this means, by necessity, if it is a disease, we need to get people into treatment. It begins to change the way we approach addiction by saying: Let’s remove the stigma so people will come forward and families are willing to talk about it.

Last night on that call, when 68 percent of the respondents to the poll said they were directly affected by this issue, I bet many of those people had not thought about talking about that issue publicly. I think this legislation helps to establish the fact that this is a disease.

This legislation will also help deal with an underlying problem, which is how we will deal with prescription drugs in our communities. Too often in our society there has been an overprescribing of painkillers that are addictive.

I heard another story today, and I hear them every day when I am back home. This was somebody whose family member had gone to the hospital for a knee operation, and when he was done with the procedure, the doctor gave him 80 Percocets. He didn’t take any of them because he didn’t need them, but his point was: Why 80 pills? Four out of five of the heroin addicts in Ohio and around this country started with prescription drugs, and often it was very inadvertent. It was something where someone had a wisdom tooth taken out and was given a number of these prescription pain pills but didn’t understand the risks. When that person started taking them, there was a physiological change in that person’s brain. That person became addicted and that person went to heroin and that person then died of an overdose. That has happened to two families in my home State. Those parents have now come forward not to just tell that story and share their grief but to channel that grief into something positive, which is to let other parents know. That is in this legislation. We have a national awareness program to let people know about the fact that the prescription drug link to heroin, opioids, and addiction is real, and we must be very careful.

For the first time ever in Federal law, it also promotes recovery. Treatment is one thing, but as one of my friends back home who is in recovery told me, getting clean is easier, but staying clean is hard. In other words, so often what we found as we did our research around the country is that people go through a treatment program, but the recovery services aren’t

there to take them through that longer term support to enable them to stay clean. Tragically, we save a life only to see someone overdose again later. Recovery is about finishing the job and helping people get their lives back, and it is an incredibly important part of this legislation.

Earlier this week, I spoke to Faces & Voices of Recovery. They have been terrific in promoting this legislation, and just as important, letting people who are in recovery know that you have friends, that this can be addressed, and that you can come out on the other side as a person who is achieving their purpose in life and God-given abilities. You can get through this.

I was honored to speak at their rally here in Washington, DC. This was about a year ago, and they brought in people from all over the country. They had some great entertainers and people who were willing to stand up for the first time and say: I am in recovery. If you are in recovery, too, we want to embrace and help you.

One of the advocates whom I met with the other night is a woman named Sarah Nerad. Sarah is someone I have gotten to know over the years. A couple of years ago, we had a roundtable discussion as this legislation was being drafted, and Sarah told me her story. She was a recovering addict who went to Ohio State University. She found there were no support services at the university. She started a student recovery support community. That community at Ohio State University not only has a lot of people now joining and participating in it—recovering addicts, family members, and friends—but she is also now spreading this at colleges and universities around the country.

There are grants in this legislation to promote these support communities because they work, and I hold up Sarah as an example of someone who was brave and courageous enough to talk about her addiction and therefore was able to get other people attracted to her and her support group. As a result, she was able to go on and help so many other people and change so many other lives, and really, in her case, to be able to say that she is a major part of this legislation, because we included this partly because of her testimony and her stories.

Until we end this stigma, we are not going to make the progress that we must. The Drug Enforcement Agency tells us that this is not getting better, this is getting worse. They tell us that from 2010 until the most recent data we have, which is 2014, there has been a tripling of heroin overdoses.

In my own State of Ohio, we have seen a dramatic increase. Since March 10, when 94 Senators voted for CARA, we have lost more than 14,000 Americans. Think about that. Since March 10, more than 14,000 Americans have succumbed. In other words, they have overdosed and died from heroin and

prescription drugs, opioid overdoses. Unfortunately, this is just the tip of the iceberg.

As horrible as those numbers are—the 14,000 overdose deaths—think of all the casualties. Think of the 16,000 people in Ohio who have been saved from overdoses by Narcan. But many of them have not gotten into treatment, have not gone into recovery, and they continue to be broken apart from their families. The drugs are everything—not their kids, not their parents. They continue to be unable or unwilling to work. They continue to commit crimes. In most communities in my home State of Ohio, law enforcement will tell us that the No. 1 cause of crime is this issue. They continue to be unable to pursue their God-given abilities. Those are the casualties of this.

No one suffers alone. In Ohio, we are told that 200,000 people are now struggling with addiction. That is the size of a major city in Ohio. Many of those addicted are parents. We are told that 30 percent—think about this—30 percent of all kids in Ohio who are in the custody of the State are there because their parents are opioid users. Among infants, that number is 70 percent. Seventy percent of the infants who are in the custody of the State of Ohio are there because their parents are opioid users. I call that an epidemic.

It is driving up crime, as I said. In Marion, OH, Police Chief Bill Collins put it this way: “All of the property crimes we have—the shoplifting, the theft, the robberies—all go back to one thing, and that’s heroin.” That is a quote from him. He says that this epidemic makes him and other law enforcement officials feel like they are “in the ocean without a life jacket.” That is what we are trying to do with CARA, is to provide that life jacket.

It is not just the silver bullet. It won’t solve all the problems. Washington is not going to solve this problem—it is going to be solved in our communities and in our hearts—but this will help. It will help make the Federal Government a much better partner with State and local government, with the wonderful nonprofits that are doing the good work, and with the families and the communities.

Last week, in just one 36-hour period in Akron, OH, 20 people overdosed on opioids, 3 of them fatally. That is not even 2 days in one city. When the first responders arrived at one of the overdoses, by the way, there were two small children present.

In Central Ohio, in Columbus, nine people overdosed, two of them fatally, on Sunday. That is in one city in 1 day. Two of those occurred at McDonald’s, by the way, with families around. It was in broad daylight.

A few months ago, we lost seven-time Grammy Award winner Prince to a fentanyl overdose. We all know about Prince. You might not know that this week, 10-time Grammy Award-winning singer Chaka Khan checked into a rehabilitation center for fentanyl addic-

tion. I want to commend her for having the courage to admit she needed help and for taking the steps—very publicly—necessary to get her life back on track. This will help others to do the same thing. God bless you for doing it. I think this is, sadly, an instructive case because, much like Prince, she has fame, she has fortune, 10 No. 1 hit songs, and all of the talent you could ever ask for. Most people would say those aren’t the kinds of people who get addicted. Addiction knows no ZIP Code. Addiction spares no one. It affects people of every single background.

If you talk to people in Ohio, they get it. Ohioans understand the scope of this epidemic now, and they are taking action. They expect us to help and to take action too. That is what this legislation is about. They couldn’t believe how slow we have moved on this. They couldn’t believe these ideas that we might try to delay this further for reasons that had nothing to do with the substance.

The Talawanda School District outside of my hometown of Cincinnati, OH, announced last week that they are now adding to their health and wellness curriculum key information about opiates. I talked to a couple of superintendents today who are doing the same thing in their schools. I believe this is critical to preventing overdoses from beginning in the first place, by using better prevention and identification, keeping people from getting into that funnel of addiction, and that is what is happening. CARA supports this.

In Trumbull County, OH, more than 200 Ohioans participated in a Walk Against Heroin over the Fourth of July weekend. Again, people are starting to take action.

I know it can be very discouraging. The scope of this problem is overwhelming, but there is hope. Treatment can work. Recovery does work. If we can get this legislation to the President, I am confident he will sign it into law, and in many more of our communities we will have better treatment and better recovery and more hope for the people we represent.

I thank Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE for his work with me on this issue. He has been the coauthor of this. We started more than 3 years ago, going to conferences here in Washington, DC. We had five conferences. We brought in experts from all over the country—people whom I have talked about earlier included—from Ohio but every State. We talked about how to actually make a difference in communities around the country. We didn’t care where the idea came from—Republican, Democrat, Independent. That didn’t matter. What mattered was whether the idea made sense. Senator WHITEHOUSE and his staff have done a terrific job in keeping this bill moving and making sure we didn’t get off track.

I also thank other colleagues who have been helpful, especially Senator

KELLY AYOTTE and Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR for their passion and for their help in crafting this legislation.

The American people are tired of the partisanship. We all hear that. We all know that. It is time for us to act.

I also thank some of the staff who have been so helpful on this legislation and who have put their heart and soul into this effort, including Megan Harrington, Pam Thiessen, Mark Isakowitz, Teri Geiger, Brian Riedl, Allen Ernst, and Sarah Schmidt on my staff. I am proud of their work throughout this process.

I thank all the advocates we have worked with all across Ohio and all across the country. They have been here in Washington. They helped us to get the great vote in the House last week, and they are working today on the vote tonight or tomorrow. I want to point out in particular that Jessica Nickel has helped to keep us all moving in the same direction. The outside advocates have been terrific.

Last, I thank those who have shared their stories, and most importantly, I thank them for their willingness to allow us to hear from them. These are people who are in recovery. These are people who are in the trenches, dealing every day with this issue, who are providing the love and the attention and the support to help people get their treatment and into recovery. These are our first responders who are out there on the frontlines dealing with this issue every single day. These are our doctors and nurses who find our waiting rooms and our emergency rooms are filled with people who have addiction problems and overdoses. These are the people who work in the neonatal units with these babies who are born dependent, a 750-percent increase in my home State just in the last 12 years, and they take these babies through a recovery and treatment program so that they can be healthy and get back on track. I thank all of them.

I want to finish with a story. About a year ago I visited a treatment center in Ohio. I have been to more than a dozen treatment centers in my home State to talk about this issue and to get ideas. It was the Zeph Center, which is a center in Toledo, OH. I had asked if we could have a discussion, a roundtable discussion, and sure enough, we did. At this roundtable discussion, some people came forward who are in recovery. There were about a dozen people there. Again, I congratulate them for coming forward and for being willing to talk to me and to be public. There were people there from the community who heard their stories for the first time, and they did share their stories, but also they came ready to talk. They had reviewed the draft legislation. They had it in front of them. They had ideas. They had input. They had looked at every single section of the bill. They knew what programs were funded. They talked about what they thought worked and what didn't work in their lives. It was an ex-

ample of the process we went through with this legislation. It wasn't just a bunch of people in Washington saying we know what is best; it was people back home saying: We need this help, and we want to be sure you do it right. And by the way, keep it nonpartisan. Make sure we get this done. Don't let anything get in the way.

That is what we have done. That is what we will do tonight or tomorrow morning when we vote on this bill. That is why it is so important that we get it passed, because it is those recovering addicts at the Zeph Center and others around the State of Ohio who have patiently waited for this legislation. It is now our duty to deliver that legislation and help turn the tide in this epidemic.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

OUR AMERICAN FAMILY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to give my second speech this week discussing the issues we are facing as a nation following last week's tragedies in Dallas, Minnesota, and Baton Rouge. This speech is perhaps the most difficult because it is the most personal.

On Monday, I talked about how the vast majority of our law enforcement officers have only two things in mind: protect and serve. But, as I noted then, we do have serious issues that must be resolved.

In many cities and towns across the Nation, there is a deep divide between the Black community and law enforcement. There is a trust gap, a tension that has been growing for decades. And as a family, one American family, we cannot ignore these issues because while so many officers do good—and as I said on Monday, we should be very thankful and supportive of all of those officers who do good—some simply do not. I have experienced it myself.

So today I want to speak about some of those issues—not with anger, although I have been angry. I tell my story not out of frustration, although at times I have been frustrated. I stand here before you today because I am seeking for all of us, the entire American family, to work together so we all experience the lyrics of a song that we can hear but not see: peace, love, and understanding. Because I shuddered when I heard Eric Garner say, "I can't breathe." I wept when I watched Walter Scott turn and run away and get shot in the back and killed. And I broke when I heard the 4-year-old daughter of Philando Castile's girlfriend tell her mother, "It's OK, I'm right here with you." These are people. Lost forever. Fathers, brothers, sons.

Some will say and maybe even scream: But they have criminal records. They were criminals. They had spent time in jail.

And while having a record should not sentence you to death, I say, OK, then, I will share with you some of my own

experiences or the experiences of good friends and other professionals.

I can certainly remember the very first time I was pulled over by a police officer as just a youngster. I was driving a car that had an improper headlight. It didn't work right. And the cop came up to my car, hand on his gun, and said: Boy, don't you know your headlights are not working properly? I felt embarrassed, ashamed, and scared—very scared.

But instead of sharing experience after experience, I want to go to a time in my life as an elected official to share just a couple of stories as an elected official. But please remember that in the course of 1 year, I have been stopped seven times by law enforcement officers—not four, not five, not six, but seven times in 1 year as an elected official. Was I speeding sometimes? Sure. But the vast majority of the time I was pulled over for nothing more than driving a new car in the wrong neighborhood or some other reason just as trivial.

One of the times I remember I was leaving the mall. I took a left out of the mall, and as soon as I took a left, a police officer pulled in right behind me. That was my first time. I got to another traffic light, and I took another left into a neighborhood. The police followed behind me. I took a third left onto the street that at the time led to my apartment complex and then finally I took a fourth left coming into my apartment complex, and then the blue lights went on. The officer approached the car and said that I did not use my turn signal on the fourth turn. Keep in mind, as my colleagues might imagine, I was paying very close attention to the law enforcement officer who followed me on four turns. Do you really think that somehow I forgot to use my turn signal on the fourth turn? Well, according to him, I did.

Another time, I was following a friend of mine. We had just left working out and we were heading out to grab a bite to eat at about 4 o'clock in the afternoon. He pulls out, and I pull out right behind him. We are driving down the road, and the blue lights come on. The officer pulls me into the median, and he starts telling me that he thinks perhaps the car is stolen. Well, I started asking myself—because I was smart enough not to ask him but was asking myself—is the license plate coming in as stolen? Does the license plate match the car? I was looking for some rational reason that may have prompted him to stop me on the side of the road.

I also think about the experiences of my brother, who became a command sergeant major in the U.S. Army, the highest rank for an enlisted soldier. He was driving from Texas to Charleston and was pulled over by a law enforcement officer who wanted to know if he had stolen the car he was driving because it was a Volvo.

I do not know many African-American men who do not have a very similar story to tell, no matter the profession, no matter their income, no matter their position in life.

I also recall the story of one of my former staffers—a great guy, about 30 years old—who drove a Chrysler 300, which is a nice car, without question, but not a Ferrari, not a super nice car. He was pulled over so many times here in DC for absolutely no reason other than that he was driving a nice car. He sold that car and bought a more obscure form of transportation. He was tired of being targeted. Imagine the frustration, the irritation, the sense of a loss of dignity that accompanies each of those stops.

Even here on Capitol Hill, where I have had the great privilege of serving the people of South Carolina as a U.S. Congress Member and as a U.S. Senator for the last 6 years—for those who don't know, there are a few ways to identify a Member of Congress or Senate. Well, typically, when you have been here for a couple of years, the law enforcement officers get to know your face and they identify you by face, but if that doesn't happen, then you have an ID badge, a license you can show them, or this really cool pin. I often-times said the House pin was larger because our egos are bigger. So we have a smaller pin in the Senate. It is easy to identify a U.S. Senator by our pin.

I recall walking into an office building just last year after being here for 5 years in the capital, and the officer looked at me, full of attitude, and said, "The pin I know, and you I don't. Show me your ID." I will tell you, I was thinking to myself, either he thinks I am committing a crime, impersonating a Member of Congress, or—or what? Well, I will tell you that later that evening I received a phone call from his supervisor apologizing for the behavior. That is at least the third phone call I have received from a supervisor or the Chief of Police since I have been in the Senate.

So while I thank God I have not endured bodily harm, I have felt the pressure applied by the scales of justice when they are slanted. I have felt the anger, the frustration, the sadness, and the humiliation that comes with feeling like you are being targeted for nothing more than being just yourself.

As the former staffer I mentioned earlier told me yesterday, there is absolutely nothing more frustrating, more damaging to your soul than when you know you are following the rules and you are being treated like you are not.

But make no mistake—no matter this turmoil, these issues should not lead anyone to any conclusion other than to abide by the laws. I think the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., said it so well. Returning violence with violence only leads to more violence and to even darker nights, nights, to paraphrase, without stars. There is never ever an acceptable reason to harm a

member of our law enforcement community—ever. I don't want anybody to misinterpret the words I am saying.

Even in the times of great darkness, there is light. As I shared Monday, there are hundreds—thousands of stories of officers who go beyond the call of duty. Ms. Taylor—whom I spoke about on Monday night—at the Dallas incident was covered completely by at least three officers who were willing to lose their lives to save hers. We have a real opportunity to be grateful and thankful for our men and women in uniform.

I shared another story on Monday night as well, and while the one I want to tell you today does not involve a tragic loss of life, it does show support that meant a lot to me at the time it occurred. Prior to serving in the U.S. Senate, I was an elected official on the county level, State level, and a Member of the U.S. Congress. I believe it is my responsibility to hang out and be with my constituents as often as possible and to hear their concerns. At some point during my time as a public servant, I traveled to an event I was invited to along with two staffers and two law enforcement officers—all four were White, and me. When we arrived at the event, the organizer seemed to have a particular issue with me coming to the event. They allowed my two staffers to go into the event and seemed fine with allowing the two officers to go into the event, who both said they weren't going in unless I was going in. So in order to avoid a tense situation, I opted to leave because there is no winning that kind of debate ever. But I was so proud and thankful for those two law enforcement officers who were enraged by this treatment. It was such a moment that I will never forget and a situation that I would love to forget.

This situation happens all across the country. This situation happens all across the country whether or not we want to recognize it. It may not happen a thousand times a day, but it happens too many times a day, and to see it as I have had the chance to see it helps me understand why this issue has wounds that have not healed in a generation. It helps me to appreciate and to understand and helps me communicate why it is time for this American family to have a serious conversation about where we are, where we are going, and how to get there. We must find a way to fill these cracks in the very foundation of our country.

Tomorrow I will return with my final speech in this three-part series on solutions and how to get to where we need to go by talking about the policies that get us there and the people solutions because I, like you, Mr. President, don't believe that all answers are in government. I don't believe all the solutions we need start in government, but we need people doing things that only individuals can do.

Today, however, I simply ask you this: Recognize that just because you

do not feel the pain, the anguish of another, does not mean it does not exist. To ignore their struggles—our struggles—does not make them disappear; it simply leaves you blind and the American family very vulnerable. Some search so hard to explain away justice that they are slowly wiping away who we are as a nation. We must come together to fulfill what we all know is possible here in America—peace, love and understanding. Fairness.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE).
The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, before Senator SCOTT leaves the floor, let me say to my colleague how much I appreciate his frank discussion today. We are so blessed to have you and CORY BOOKER here. We don't have enough diversity here—let me just be clear. As much as all of us want to walk in each other's shoes because we each have different experiences in our lives, it really matters who is in the room, who is at the microphone, who is sharing the truth.

Senator SCOTT has shared a truth with us today, and I want to say Senator BOOKER shared similar stories with us in our caucus, and it is life-changing for us. I so appreciate everything you said, and it makes us better to have you and CORY BOOKER here.

RACE RELATIONS

Having said that, Mr. President, I think it is important to discuss a very similar topic, which is the status of race relations today, because I don't think Senator SCOTT and Senator BOOKER should have to be the ones to have to carry this forward.

Mr. President, when I was a little girl—I was 10—I came face-to-face with ugly, vile, stupid, and dangerous discrimination. I cheered on Jackie Robinson with all my girl power to counteract what my dad said was hatred aimed at Jackie because of the color of his skin. And how blessed was I when I worked hard with a Republican colleague to make sure Jackie Robinson got the Congressional Medal of Honor.

When I was with my mother in Florida—the same age, 10 years old, 1950—I saw African Americans forced to sit in the back of the bus. I got up to offer my seat to an elderly woman. She must have been 55 at the time—I was 10—she looked old to me. I stood up and she refused me. She said no, no. I was hurt.

I said to my mother: What is happening here? Why won't the woman take my seat?

And my mother said: Segregation.

Well, growing up in Brooklyn, this made no sense to me. My mother could have let it go; instead, she told me to follow her to the back of the bus—not that anyone noticed, but we knew exactly what we were doing. And I felt like a part of her team—part of a team against this craziness where people had to go to the back of the bus simply because of the color of their skin.

The civil rights movement has made enormous progress in our laws, but the

trouble remains in our hearts. There is too much hatred in our communities. But let's be clear. Whether you are a police officer—regardless of the color of your skin—kissing your family good-bye in the morning or the parents of a young African-American teenager, no one should ever have to fear that they will not see their loved ones at night. Yet that is a truth in America—a truth that has been witnessed by a couple of our Senators. No one should have to fear that they won't see their loved ones at night because of this type of hatred.

Now is not the time to paint whole groups of people with a broad brush because when you do that, that is the exact definition of prejudice. You can't broad-brush a whole community because of the color of their skin or their religion or whom they love, and you can't broad-brush all the police in the police department.

What we need is a de-escalation of suspicion and an escalation of trust—a de-escalation of suspicion and an escalation of trust. It is long past time that we stood together united. It is long past time that we look inside our own hearts, look inside our own souls, and banish the hatred. We must instead embrace each other and God's creation, because we—each of us—are God's creation. Dr. Martin Luther King wrote: "Men often hate each other because they fear each other; they fear each other because they don't know each other; they don't know each other because they cannot communicate; they cannot communicate because they are separated."

That is what Martin Luther King said—a man who taught us love, a man who taught us compassion, a man who taught us nonviolence, a man who taught us to listen to each other, a man who taught us to walk in each other's shoes. So we need that conversation. We start it by breaking down barriers that separate us, bridging the gap between communities and law enforcement and establishing trust. Healing will begin in the streets. It should.

Policing should be for the community, by the community, and with the community. When I was a county supervisor in the 1970s, there were police-versus-community issues. So I recommended, and my colleagues concurred, in a new system of community policing. What does it mean? It means you get the police out of a central precinct and you move them into the community. Relationships develop. It seems so right. It works so well that I was shocked when I got out of local government and I realized that not enough communities were following that same community policing method.

Where it exists, there is cooperation and true protection of the community. It is an obvious step that should be implemented widely. Well, what can we do? We can't force people to love. We can suggest it. We can't force people to be tolerant. We can suggest it. But I

think there are certain things we can do.

I have introduced legislation with Senator CORY BOOKER. It is called the PRIDE Act. It would start us off by getting statistics that we need. How many shootings are there in our communities by the police toward the community? How many shootings by the community toward the police are there? Believe it or not, we don't really collect those numbers. We would provide funding for States for the use-of-force training for law enforcement agencies and personnel, including de-escalation and violence training and funding for tip lines and hotlines and public awareness announcements to gain information regarding the use of force against the police. So it is a very balanced piece of legislation that looks at the problems on both sides.

Secondly, we need to better support law enforcement agencies who work to advance the practice of community policing. Now, we can do that by increasing funding federally for the Justice Department's Community Policing Development Program, which provides law enforcement agencies with funding to implement innovative community policing practices. But guess what; the funding for this critical program, which may well be one of our most important programs, is \$8 million a year. That is it for the whole country. It is not enough. We need to do better.

Number three, we should provide dedicated funding for Justice Department programs to initiate formal gatherings or summits to bring community members and police into one conversation. Anyone who looked at Dallas understands how hard they are trying, how much they have done. When I saw President Obama with Mrs. Obama and President George W. Bush with Laura Bush, I was so happy.

They are starting that conversation, the building of that trust, the tearing down of that suspicion. One of the founders of Black Lives Matter, Alicia Garza, said:

"We have so many different experiences that are rich and complex. We need to bring all those experiences to the table in order to achieve the solutions we desire."

To anyone listening to Senator SCOTT or anyone who has heard the stories or read some of the words of Senator BOOKER, we have a lot to learn. A U.S. Senator was stopped—he said seven times; this is what I heard Senator SCOTT say—in one year because of the color of his skin. What? It is just too much for these people to bear. We need to help them change policies that lead to this suspicion.

Yes, we have so many different experiences that are rich and complex. We need to bring those experiences to the table. My friend the Senator from Alaska is here. We are only 20 women out of 100 Senators. I think our colleagues understand that we have brought something to the body. We have brought our experiences to the body. It transcends partisanship. When we are in the room,

it is a little bit of a different conversation. Not that we are any better, but we have had different experiences. When our African-American colleagues tell us: Look at our lives. Look at what we have been through. We have the same job as you. Why are we pulled over seven times in a year? Why have we been scared? Something is wrong. We can't turn our back on it. We can't leave it up to just those two colleagues to lead us. We need to help them, work together, and have this conversation that Alicia Garza says we should have.

Number four, we must formally recognize and encourage police departments that epitomize what it means to be a keeper of the peace—a keeper of the peace. That is what they want to be—those officers who attend community meetings after work, who spend their Saturdays playing basketball with the neighborhood kids, who attend church services so they can connect with the congregants, who take lower income children shopping for toys and gifts at Christmas, who stop to check in on residents just because they care. That is happening all over the country. That is why we can't paint people with a broad brush. It is wrong.

In my State, in the community of Vallejo, in the San Francisco Bay Area, you should see what some of these officers do. They had a growing divide between the community and the police. The police department knew something had to change. So they invited the public to participate in those changes. They held open-door community meetings. They created a citizen advisory board to ensure residents' voices were heard. They invited residents to experience their training simulator and give them a new perspective on that police experience.

See it through our eyes, they said, and we will see it through your eyes, and let's deescalate the tension and escalate the trust. They put a high importance on the hiring of officers who had a connection to Vallejo and wanted to serve the public. They even started a late-night youth program at the local high school. They started change from within that community.

So I think we should have a community policing innovation fund at the Justice Department which would reward law enforcement agencies and localities that are doing the right thing.

Lastly, I want to bring up that issue where everyone goes into their corners. I beg colleagues not to go into their corners. We have to address gun violence. Now, we know we can't prevent every tragedy. But we can do some smart things while protecting the Second Amendment.

We don't need military weapons on the streets. They are weapons of war. The family of the gentleman who developed these weapons said to his family: I didn't develop them for people on the streets; I developed them for the military and law enforcement. We can't have the people who are protecting us outgunned. We don't need

these weapons on the streets. There is only one reason—to kill as many people as you can as fast as you can without reloading.

Don't tell me hunters need this. That is a bunch of baloney. The people who want to keep these weapons on the street are the ones who sell them. Let's be clear. The vast majority of people support this. We can expand background checks—90 percent of the people support that, even a majority of NRA members—so we can keep guns out of the hands of criminals and the mentally ill.

We should prohibit the sale or possession of high-capacity magazines and end the ban preventing the Centers for Disease Control from researching gun violence. Have you talked to doctors who work in big city hospitals? I have. They say: We are prepared to go to any war zone. Those are the kinds of wounds they see. They tremble at what they see. They mourn about what they see.

Somebody goes out to a nightclub. They hide in the bathroom. They call their mother. They never see their family again.

My State of California has created a new research center on gun violence to understand the impact of firearm fatalities and injuries and, hopefully, reduce them in the future. It should happen at the Federal level.

There are 30,000 of our people killed a year by gun violence. We lost 55,000 to 60,000 in the Vietnam War—a 10-year period. It tore the country apart. This is 300,000 of our people over 10 years.

So I am going to close with this. There will always be bad people. I have lived long enough to know that. There will always be bad people. There will always be lost people. There will also be mean people. But we cannot and must not allow them to poison this Nation wherever they are. Good people—and that is most of America—must join hands across every line that divides us—race, religion, color, creed, and, yes, politics.

We must call out the racists, the prejudiced, and the haters—whoever they are, wherever they are—even if they are in elected office. We have to support those who believe in community, who believe in community policing and not support those who refuse to admit that there is a problem with profiling. Just read what Senator SCOTT said about his life, about his fears, about what happened to him. Ask CORY BOOKER, a Rhodes Scholar, what it is like.

We have to support those activists who bring us together, support steps to improve our institutions, and reject those who inflame fears on any side in which they are found.

We must speak out and support those who believe this is the United States of America, not the “Divided States of America,” and we will not allow this Nation to be divided by race, color, creed, religion, or whom you love. I know America. I believe we will over-

come. I want to quote JOHN LEWIS as I close. He was beaten, bloodied, and jailed, fighting for civil rights. He tells this story, and I quote:

“I saw those signs that said ‘white men,’ ‘colored men,’ ‘white women,’ ‘colored women,’ ‘white waiting,’ ‘colored waiting.’

I would come home and ask my mother, my father, my grandparents, my great grand-parents, ‘Why?’

They would say: ‘That’s the way it is. Don’t get in the way. Don’t get in trouble.’”

He goes on:

“In 1957, I met Rosa Parks at the age of 17.

In 1958, at the age of 18, I met Martin Luther King, Jr., and these two individuals inspired me to get in the way, to get in trouble.

So, I encourage you to find a way to get in the way. You must find a way to get in trouble—good trouble, necessary trouble.”

That is JOHN LEWIS. We are blessed to have this hero, JOHN LEWIS, among us in the Congress. We must listen to him because he is right. It is our job to get in the way of prejudice and hate. We may do it each in his or her own way. My way may not be your way, but our way is to fight against prejudice and hate wherever we see it. Our job is to move forward with respect and understanding, with tolerance and love.

Our Founders knew we were not a perfect union. They told us we had to make a more perfect union. That is our job. I know we can do it, and we must do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COLA ACT OF 2016

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 5588, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5588) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2016, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 5588) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, there is a great deal of discussion this week on very difficult and hard issues.

The comments of the Senator from California, which were preceded by the comments of our colleague from South Carolina, remind us that as lawmakers, as policymakers, our jobs are indeed difficult, as we do try to make good on that pledge for a more perfect union because we are clearly not there today.

I am on the floor to speak to another type of killer that we face in this country, and that is the killer that comes with drugs, substance abuse, illegal drugs, opioids, heroin—this insidious scourge that has afflicted us as a nation. We are fortunate in that we have an opportunity—hopefully soon—to be voting for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, CARA.

I thank all of my colleagues who have been involved in this effort, very aggressively pushing this bill. Senator PORTMAN from Ohio, Senator AYOTTE from New Hampshire are among the many who have stepped forward to really shine a light on an area where we know that we need to work to develop a comprehensive solution, a community-focused solution to so much of what we are dealing with.

The CARA act touches on all areas of this issue, from education to awareness, from access to treatment to preventing and treating overdose, from families to veterans to infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome, and even teens who may suffer a sports injury. Opioid and heroin addiction is a serious threat to our Nation's prosperity, and the legislative initiative that we have in front of us is one way to fight back.

The rates of opioid abuse have skyrocketed. Drug overdose-related deaths have more than quadrupled since 1999. When an addict can no longer afford to get access to opioids, we find, unfortunately, that they oftentimes turn to heroin, a cheaper alternative with similar effects.

The rates of heroin overdose have tripled between 2010 and 2014. In my State of Alaska, we like to think that sometimes we are far enough away geographically that we are isolated or insulated from some of what happens in the lower 48. But in fact we have seen instances of heroin use, opioid abuse, that have resulted in statistics that are shattering. Efforts to prevent those deaths by overdose have resulted in many States, like the State of Alaska, passing legislation which has removed the liability for a family member to administer the lifesaving drug naloxone. CARA does this, as well, through grants that improve access to medically assisted treatment, opening access treatment to overdose treatment, and it provides for first responder training.

Over the course of these many months, there have been so many personal horror stories about the impact of opioid and heroin addiction in our respective States. We have witnessed the sense of urgency and desperation as we hear those stories from families who are truly desperately seeking help.

Too often those families face a multitude of different challenges from treatment centers that are at capacity, very expensive private options—if you can find them—that put families in a financial bind. In so many cases, there is just no option. In Alaska our options are extraordinarily limited, so what happens is that you have to send your loved one outside of the State to find treatment if you can find it. There are so many of our families that simply lack the tools or the resources to help those they love who are suffering from substance abuse. They don't have the resources, and they really don't know where to turn. They don't even know whom to talk to.

Addiction to opioids and heroin does not just harm the individual; it breaks the community. It leaves these communities with a sense of hopelessness amongst the loss.

But despite the anguish that we know that addiction brings, I actually have been very inspired by several of the communities in my State that have really come together to fight back and to deal with the levels of addiction that they see in their communities and say: No, we are going to be engaged; we are going to come together to make a difference.

In 2014, the community of Juneau lost seven young people—all in their early twenties—to drug overdoses. After they lost their loved ones, what happened was that these families just kind of closed up. It was very difficult, extraordinarily hard, to be able to talk about what had happened because, quite honestly, of the stigma that is attached to drug abuse.

By 2015, a year later, that community came together and said: Enough. Our silence is not going to help anyone.

So they came together to help support families. They formed a group that provides support, educational tools, and community outreach.

This group, which is called Stop Heroin, Start Talking, works proactively with Alaska's young people, goes into the classrooms to talk with the kids early on about drug abuse, and focuses on making kids active participants in the discussion, instead of just kind of preaching the talk to them.

In the Matanuska Valley, another group called Fiend 2 Clean runs a Facebook page and reaches out to at-risk teens in the community. They also run a peer-run support system that really empowers these young people by reminding them: Look, you are not alone in this. We are here as a resource, we are here to talk to, and we are here with you.

Fiend 2 Clean works with another organization called MyHouse to empower young people and really support them as they are developing job skills, building self-worth, and understanding their role in the community. These peer-focused programs make the difference. They really help make the difference in the day-to-day lives of these young people, their families, and their com-

munities. More importantly, these efforts highlight the importance of making sure that all members of the community are involved in addressing addiction.

CARA acknowledges that any successful efforts at combating opioid and heroin addiction must focus on building community-centered and culturally inclusive methods that engage everyone who may be impacted by drug abuse.

The grants within CARA will give States and local communities the funding, as well as the tools they need, to build these sorts of relationships and work toward not just treating but really preventing that abuse up front.

We have seen rapid rates of prescribing opioids for pain, largely due to a lack of consensus on uniformity or prescribing opioids. While many State legislative bodies in the Department of Health and Human Services have already begun to do their part in addressing prescribing guidelines and establishing prescription drug-monitoring programs, CARA takes this one step further. The task force on pain management will provide more information about pain management practices by supporting evidence-based practices as they examine the trends of opioid prescription nationwide.

CARA also offers support for our Nation's veterans by improving opioid prescribing safety measures within the VA system through education and training on pain management for our providers. I think we have all heard far too many stories of concerns from our veterans or from their families where, in an effort to get a vet through the system and with not enough providers or with a backlog, the easiest thing to do is just to provide a prescription for pain medication rather than really trying to work to rebuild that body.

In addition, there are provisions to improve patient advocacy, support the integration of care, and enable multiple treatment options—depending on that particular veteran's needs—really moving away from this rush to prescribe opioid medications.

CARA provides the support and treatment needed for postpartum mothers and infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome and establishes a pilot program meant to enhance funding flexibility so that States can support the services that will properly benefit women and their children. CARA will also improve the reporting and understanding of addiction related to youth sports injuries. I think we recognize that kids are out playing soccer or basketball, doing things, and they get hurt. Those providers who are treating them need to be included in the discussion of how to treat sports-related youth injuries. Kids shouldn't just be given highly addictive medications, opening them up to possibly future addiction. Again, let's look at comprehensive pain management care that is focused on different treatment options.

The families, friends, and communities that are working together to address opioid addiction need to know that they are not alone and that the situations they face are not hopeless.

We can provide that hope. We can provide the tools needed to build up these communities so they can really come together to fight back against the addiction that we see. I think that by moving forward and passing CARA, we take the steps to do this.

This legislation takes into consideration the diversity and the magnitude of the opioid epidemic and works to address this issue head-on through improved research, pain management practices, community-focused programs, and opening up the dialogue about drug addiction because we know that the more we allow ourselves to talk openly and honestly about this issue, the more that stigma fades.

CARA is an encouraging first step. We all know there is much more work to be done, and I certainly remain dedicated to the fight against substance abuse now and well into the future.

With that, I yield the floor.

(At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD).

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today we have the opportunity to vote on an important piece of legislation that will support efforts to combat the opioid epidemic our country is facing. In my home State of Oklahoma, we have seen deaths from prescription drug overdose on the rise. In 2014, Oklahoma set a new record in the number of deaths by overdose. During that time, 864 people lost their lives and 510 of those people had prescription drugs as the cause. Oklahoma has continuously ranked near the top of the nation in narcotic prescribing activity and overdose deaths.

In 2015, Oklahoma sought to address this problem by introducing House bill 1948 that requires doctors to check an online database before prescribing opioids. This law went into effect in November and was designed to help spot patients who are receiving prescriptions from several physicians at the same time, a practice known as doctor-shopping. Oklahoma is taking an important step in addressing the opioid epidemic, but as we know, this does not just affect my State, but the entire Nation.

The Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, CARA, will provide grants to States to fight the abuse of prescription pain relievers and heroin, as well as grants that address criminal justice activities, treatment of pregnant and postpartum women with substance abuse problems, first responder education and training and treatment and recovery programs.

In addition, CARA addresses the opioid issue as it affects the veterans' community specifically. Our veterans have put their lives on the line to protect our Nation, and it is our job to make sure that they are getting the

treatment and prevention services they deserve. Many of our veterans come home with painful injuries that will alter their daily lives going forward. It is important that, through the Department of Veteran's Affairs, we develop best practices for pain management that do not lead to addiction. CARA addresses this by requiring that all VA employees who prescribe opioids receive education and training on pain management and safe opioid prescribing practices.

This truly is a comprehensive response to the opioid epidemic, and I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill as we take an important step in combating this addiction crisis.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

IRAN

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, tomorrow will mark 1 year since the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, China, and Iran reached an agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining or developing a nuclear weapon. This afternoon, I intend to review where we are today 1 year after the deal—also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA. I am grateful a number of my colleagues will come to the floor today as well, or are submitting statements for the RECORD, reviewing where we are 1 year later.

As I said 1 year ago, roughly—in September—when I ultimately decided, after long and thorough and detailed consideration, to support the agreement, those of us determined to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran have a real, enduring, and ongoing responsibility to undertake consistent and clear-eyed assessments of how this agreement fares and not just over the course of its first year but over the many years to come.

In short, in my assessment so far, this deal has done what it intended to do. Because of aggressive enforcement of the terms of the agreement, the JCPOA has cut off Iran's most likely short-term uranium and plutonium pathways to building a nuclear weapon. The time it would take for Iran to break out, to assemble enough fissile material for one nuclear weapon has extended significantly from just 2 to 3 months to well over a year.

The international community, in turn, has upheld its commitments under the deal, providing Iran with relief from nuclear-related sanctions. More importantly, the agreement has given the IAEA, or the International Atomic Energy Agency—the world's nuclear watchdog—unprecedented searching access to oversee all of Iran's nuclear activities with intrusive inspections and round-the-clock remote monitoring.

I will review for a few more minutes all the different ways I and some of my colleagues have worked to ensure effective enforcement of this agreement.

First, as to the IAEA inspections I just mentioned. At my urging, the Sen-

ate State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee provided nearly \$95 million in funding for the IAEA—a \$5 million increase over the level requested by President Obama. On top of giving the IAEA greater resources, this increase, I believe, sends a strong signal to Iran and our international partners that we intend to enforce the JCPOA; that we intend to encourage voluntary contributions by our international partners to strengthen the agency and to sustain its ability to take advantage of the unique opportunities under this agreement for a searching and continuing insight into Iran's nuclear activity.

Advocating for additional U.S. support for the IAEA is just one of the steps my colleagues and I have taken over the past year to ensure the nuclear agreement is implemented effectively and enforced strictly. In a series of 15 floor speeches since December, during which I have been joined by nearly a dozen members of my caucus, I have sought to keep this agreement on our radar to ensure that Congress is effectively monitoring it and that we are relentlessly enforcing its terms.

Holding Iran accountable doesn't just mean enforcing the JCPOA. It also means pushing back on that regime's bad behavior across the Middle East—behavior that falls outside the scope of the nuclear agreement. That is why I have called for the Obama administration to strengthen its efforts to interdict Iranian arms shipments to the Houthi rebels in Yemen, and—like a police department after a successful drug bust—to then publicize that those interdictions have occurred and the weapons they have seized, demonstrating to the American people and our partners in the Middle East the full scope of Iran's destabilizing activities and our intention to keep cracking down on those activities, which is crucial to building a broad coalition that will sustainably counter Iranian aggression.

That is why I have also worked with my colleagues to provide \$117 million this year for the U.S. Treasury's Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, which enforces American sanctions against bad actors, including enforcing some of the very sanctions that crippled Iran's economy and forced it to the negotiating table in the first place. That funding represents a significant increase of \$17 million since 2013, and I am fighting for an additional \$6 million this next fiscal year.

I have also held discussions with foreign leaders, from Israel to Saudi Arabia, India, Qatar, Turkey, and Russia, about how we can work together to sustainably counter Iranian aggression. I have called on the administration to levy new sanctions against an entity affiliated with Iran's hardline Revolutionary Guard Corps, known as Mahan Air, and I will make the same demand of the next administration.

I have worked to impose penalties on Iran for its dangerous and provocative

behavior, which means taking action against their destabilizing support for the murderous Assad regime in Syria and their promotion of terrorism throughout the Middle East, Iran's ongoing ballistic missile tests, and the regime's human rights abuses, from its executions of juveniles to its detention of journalists and Iranian-American citizens.

I have also joined my colleague Senator GRAHAM in leading a letter to President Obama calling on the administration to include a strengthened 10-year MOU, or memorandum of understanding, on defense priorities with our vital ally Israel.

I am determined to continue these efforts in the months and years to come. We cannot avert our eyes from Iran's destructive behavior, even as we review what progress has been made in the year since the JCPOA.

If we are to ensure that agreement remains intact, if we are to succeed in our task of preventing Iran from developing or obtaining a nuclear weapon, Congress must play an active role. If the agreement succeeds, we should recognize those successes. If Iran falls short of the terms of the agreement, we need to make certain the international community reacts swiftly to bring Iran back into compliance.

Regardless of whether my colleagues opposed or supported this agreement a year ago, regardless of where one stood then, we all have an interest today in working together to ensure we prevent Iran from ever being able to develop a nuclear weapon. We have a responsibility then to review Iran's actions and hold them accountable through aggressive enforcement of the deal, pushing back on their bad behavior, and maintaining a credible conventional deterrent.

As my colleagues comments later today will make clear, in addition to holding Iran to the terms of the nuclear deal, we have to push back against their dangerous nonnuclear bad behavior—as I mentioned, the ballistic missile tests, human rights violations, and support for terrorism.

I know my colleagues and I remain committed to overseeing strict enforcement of the nuclear agreement with Iran and protecting the security of our allies and partners in the Middle East, especially our vital ally Israel. I also know we remain committed to showing that international engagement and multilateral diplomacy can be effective, even with rogue regimes like Iran.

These commitments are why my colleagues and I are on the floor this afternoon and evening. These commitments will continue tomorrow, as the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on which I serve, holds a hearing that will review closely where we are 1 year since the JCPOA.

I thank Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN for regularly holding hearings to assess the nuclear deal and for convening tomorrow's hearing, which I look forward to attending.

Our commitment to overseeing the implementation of this important agreement can and must continue for its entire duration. Even if another crisis emerges, we must remain vigilant and push for the most aggressive enforcement of this deal and not be distracted by developments in other parts of the world. That is my commitment for as long as I have the honor of representing the people of Delaware in the Senate.

I am grateful to some of my colleagues who will join me on the floor later today—Senator CARPER, Senator PETERS, and Senator BLUMENTHAL. I would also like to thank the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. CASEY, for his steadfast effort to support our vital ally Israel and ensure swift multilateral consequences for JCPOA violations.

In closing, let me say this. We—this body, this Congress, the people of this country—must make a clear distinction between the Iranian regime and the Iranian people. The Iran regime deserves scrutiny, condemnation, and opposition for a decades-long pattern of human rights abuses, support for terrorism, and bad behavior, but the Iranian people deserve our support in their fight for freedom, democracy, and human rights.

With that, I am hopeful we will hear soon from my good friend and fellow Delawarean, the senior Senator from our State of neighbors, who has been a leader in my State for decades. I know later this evening we will also hear on these important topics from Senators PETERS and BLUMENTHAL as well.

I am grateful to all of my colleagues who have joined me in colloquies and statements on the floor on this important topic in the past, and I just hope we can, in a sustainable and bipartisan way, insist on effective and rigorous enforcement of this deal throughout its entire term.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, this week we are marking the 1-year anniversary of the signing of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. This week, 1 year ago, my colleagues and I began the enormous task of reading, analyzing, and making a decision about whether or not we would support the deal.

For me, that task took 6 weeks of careful study, several classified briefings, countless meetings with experts and conversations with constituents. As I wrote, on September 1 last year, “This agreement will substantially constrain the Iranian nuclear program for its duration, and compared with all realistic alternatives, it is the best option available to us at this time.”

We were under no delusions that the JCPOA would be a panacea for all of our problems with Iran. Rather, it was envisioned and designed to meaningfully address one major issue: Iran’s pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability.

In my decision, I wrote, “We need not, and indeed should not, trust the

Iranian regime.” On the 1-year anniversary of the deal, that statement remains true.

One of the strengths of the JCPOA is a robust, arguably unprecedented, monitoring and verification mechanism. We need to fully fund the International Atomic Energy Agency in support of its efforts to monitor Iran’s compliance with the JCPOA; that is why I supported an increase to the U.S. voluntary contribution to the IAEA in this year’s budget.

We also need to see greater transparency from the IAEA. On July 6, Ambassador Dennis Ross wrote, “Recent reports from the International Atomic Energy Agency indicate that Iran is in compliance with the JCPOA, but the level of information they provide is dramatically less than that found in previous IAEA reports on Iran’s nuclear program.”

Specifically, Ambassador Ross identified several key elements of the deal that were not included in the IAEA’s most recent report: the amount of low enriched uranium currently stockpiled in Iran, the number of centrifuges still operating at Natanz, and research and development activity on centrifuges, to name a few. I urge the administration to work with the P5+1 and the IAEA to increase the transparency of these reports. If Iran is indeed complying, there should be no need to hide the details.

My decision was also predicated on the assumption that Iran would continue to foment instability and support terrorism in the region. The JCPOA did not address this issue, and likewise, it in no way curtailed our ability to sanction and hold accountable terrorist groups and facilitators. These tough sanctions remain in full force and effect.

Iran continues its aggressive and destabilizing actions in the region, including by providing robust financial and material support to its terrorist proxies, Hezbollah and Hamas, as well as to the murderous Assad regime in Syria and the Houthi rebels in Yemen.

Iran unequivocally remains the world’s leading state sponsor of terrorism. The Hezbollah Secretary General Hassan Nasrallah recently stated, “Hezbollah’s budget, its income, its expenses, everything it eats and drinks, its weapons and rockets, come from the Islamic Republic of Iran.” We know that Hezbollah is seeking advanced rocket capability, which could be used against Israel. We know that Hezbollah has become the ground force of the Assad regime in many parts of Syria.

Last week, I introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator ISAKSON called the Stop Terrorist Resources and Money, or STORM Act. This bill will authorize the President to designate countries that are not doing enough to stop terrorist financiers and facilitators as “Jurisdictions of Terrorism Financing Concern.” With that designation comes significant penalties or the requirement to enter into a

technical assistance agreement with the United States to improve their capability to investigate and prosecute terrorist financiers. Although Iran is already designated a state sponsor of terrorism, the President could use this new authority to hold accountable jurisdictions where Iranian terrorist proxies and their supporters operate with relative impunity.

When the Iranians complain that they are not getting the influx of European business that they anticipated following the deal, maybe they need to take a hard look at their support for terrorism. With the sanctions on Iran for terrorism and human rights still firmly in force, it is no wonder that European financial institutions and other businesses are wary of doing business in Iran.

One year on from the signing of the JCPOA, I continue to believe that implementation of this agreement is firmly in our strategic interests. We knew that implementation would be difficult and that the Iranians could not be trusted.

Rigorous congressional oversight has been critical in this first year. We have pushed for increased sanctions on illicit ballistic missile activity, and the administration responded. We have tightened sanctions on Hezbollah and introduced new legislation to counter terrorism financing more broadly. We have advocated for a transformative investment in our defense relationship with Israel, which continues to face threats from Iran and its proxies. We will continue to ask tough questions and demand answers.

We will also continue to prepare for the possibility that Iran may violate the agreement. This means maintaining the legal architecture that would be needed to snap back sanctions in the event of a violation; I have said that I will support a clean reauthorization of the Iran Sanctions Act. This also means toughening our deterrence policy, both here in Congress and in the White House, to ensure, as I wrote in my statement last year, “The Iranian regime should not doubt our capability and willingness to respond swiftly should they attempt to break out and develop a nuclear weapon.”

One year after the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action was signed, we should redouble our commitment to ensuring that Iran cannot acquire a nuclear weapons capability and be firm in our resolve to counter their aggressive actions in the Middle East. But we should also commend the wisdom of this body for allowing the agreement to go forward, as it remains the best available alternative to constrain Iran’s nuclear ambitions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the only remaining postcloture time be the following: Capito-Baldwin, 15 minutes; Carper, 10 minutes; Markey, 10 minutes; further,

that following the use or yielding back of that time, that all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate vote on the adoption of the conference report to accompany S. 524.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING CARLA HAYDEN

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I would like to begin my statement first of all by congratulating Carla Hayden, who was just confirmed as the 14th Librarian of Congress. I know she will do a good job. I am very proud of her and I look forward to working with her and the Library.

Mr. President, earlier today I was proud to support cloture for the CARA bill. It puts us on track to reverse this epidemic and promises to provide help to so many who are impacted by addiction. We will be hearing also from my friend and colleague Senator BALDWIN because we both believe strongly that our veterans are one of those many groups this bill seeks to assist.

A little over a year ago, under the leadership of Senator BALDWIN—and I thank her for that—the two of us introduced the Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act, which provides safer and more effective pain management for our Nation's veterans. This legislation, named after U.S. Marine veteran Jason Simcakoski of Wisconsin, who died at the Tomah Veterans Affairs Medical Center as a result of a mixed drug toxicity, is included in the CARA bill. In fact, title IX of the bill is titled the Jason Simcakoski Memorial and Promise Act.

Tragically, stories like Jason's exist all around the country, including my own State of West Virginia. Andrew White, another marine, returned home to West Virginia only to be placed on a cocktail of drugs, including anti-psychotics, over twice the recommended dosage. Andrew died in his sleep at the age of 23.

Far too many of our veterans have returned home from overseas to fight another battle here at home. This legislation will update and strengthen the guidelines for opioid prescriptions and require—require—the VA to expand the scope of research, education, delivery, and integration of alternative pain management.

Chronic pain should not be something our veterans are forced to live with, and the VA must be on the cutting edge of developing effective pain management. Our hope is, this will provide the VA with the tools it needs to help prevent these types of tragedies from occurring.

Again, I thank Senator BALDWIN for her very great work in this area.

So many across the Nation, and particularly in rural States like West Virginia, which has the unfortunate distinction of having the largest amount of drug-related overdose deaths—more than twice the national average—are impacted by addiction. CARA is a comprehensive step forward in the national response to this drug epidemic.

We have heard throughout the day how it expands prevention, education, promotes resources for treatment and recovery. It includes reforms to help our law enforcement create alternatives to incarceration, such as successful drug court programs.

We have also heard of the many organizations that are in support of this—over 200. It may be approaching 300 now. These organizations deal with addiction and the results of addiction on a daily basis. I believe one of the reasons so many organizations support this bill—and I know that part of the reason I am so proud to support the bill—is it addresses how addiction affects not only the addict or their family but the well-being of an entire community.

Following a drug prevention seminar I held last year, one of my constituents said:

There is a need for the community to be involved in resolving the drug addiction issue. It is my hope and prayer that we can find community based solutions that will improve the lives of all the citizens in our community, county and state.

CARA contains many ideas and opens the door for communities to take actions to help neighborhoods and schools. It authorizes much needed programs for prevention and education.

Another one of my constituents wrote:

Our young people are dying off by the dozens and a generation of children think of this as normal.

Some of the saddest letters I have received have been about those who have already lost their battle to the scourge against addiction. A grandmother from Martinsburg wrote the following:

Our granddaughter—that tall, exuberant redhead who laughed her way into our hearts, is now a statistic.

As a grandmother myself, I love the way she phrased that—laughed her way into our hearts.

Several days ago our son called to tell us that she had died the night before from a heroin overdose. . . . It was that quick. Our granddaughter started her drug journey with prescription drug opiates. When those pills weren't enough, heroin stepped in, and the downward spiral began.

It isn't just the problem kids . . . who get hooked. Our granddaughter came from a stable, affectionate home. Even though her parents tried their best to save her with countless sleepless nights, multiple trips to rehabs, tough love and loving persuasion, that drug won the battle.

Now, we are not even allowed to grieve. We must also contend with the many forms of our anger; impatience with our granddaughter for not being stronger, rage at those who sold her the drugs, frustration with the authorities for not doing more to stop the trafficking or establishing more treatment centers, and self-recrimination for maybe not doing enough.

We are also trying to cope with the guilt of feeling relief that her hell is finally over. There is nothing more we can do for her now, no more treatments that we can try.

She's gone. Just . . . gone.

Will the passage of CARA stop all overdoses or ensure that no other grandmother or family feels this an-

guish? No. But it does begin to address the frustrations and pain this grandmother and so many others feel. CARA attempts to break the cycle of repeated overdoses by encouraging the use of followup services for those who have received the drug naloxone to reverse the opioid overdose.

Too many stories of addiction start like this one, with prescription pain killers. By allowing the partial fill of certain opioid prescriptions, reviewing best practices for acute pain management, and expanding prescription take-back days and locations, CARA will reduce the number of unused painkillers and hopefully prevent future cases of drug abuse and addiction.

We cannot continue to lose 129 granddaughters, sisters, fathers, neighbors, and friends every single day to drug overdoses. As I have said before and will say again, we will lose a generation if we don't address this crisis now. This cannot be the new normal for our young people or for our communities.

I commend all who have worked on this bill to get us to this point. It is time to pass CARA and send it to the President's desk. Our communities in West Virginia and across the country cannot afford to wait any longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, Congress is taking a critical first step to combat our country's opioid crisis and a major step in providing safer, more effective, and higher quality care for America's veterans.

I want to speak about my bipartisan Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act, which is included in the final version of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, known as CARA. This bipartisan legislation reforms opioid prescribing and pain care at the VA.

These bipartisan reforms to veterans health care that I authored, along with my colleague Senator SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, should unite us all. They represent our responsibility to honor and care for those who have served and sacrificed for our Nation, and their families—and all our families.

This bipartisan legislation is named in honor of Wisconsin Marine Veteran Jason Simcakoski. On August 30, 2014, Jason tragically died. He died in Wisconsin's Tomah Veterans Affairs Medical Center of mixed-drug toxicity. At the time of his death, Jason was on 14 different prescription drugs, including opioids.

Jason's heartbreaking story is just one example of the overprescribing and pain care problem within the VA in Wisconsin and across the country. I believe the VA's overreliance on opioids has resulted in getting our veterans hooked rather than getting them the help they need, and it is our job to act now to address this epidemic.

At this time last year, I joined Senator CAPITO on the Senate floor to introduce our bipartisan measure in honor of Jason and the entire

Simcakoski family. I was proud to work closely with the Simcakoski family, as well as medical professionals and veterans service organizations, to craft these reforms to prevent Jason's tragedy from happening to any other veteran or their family.

This legislation, shortly to be approved by the U.S. Senate, will provide safer and more effective pain management services to our Nation's veterans by strengthening and updating VA opioid prescribing guidelines. It will enhance education and training and expand access to opioid alternatives. It will create an independent Office of Patient Advocacy at the VA to give veterans and their families a stronger voice in their care. The bill strengthens VA hiring practices to help prevent bad doctors from treating veterans. It will hold VA accountable for providing quality care to our veterans by strengthening opioid oversight and reporting.

The story of Jason's bill is a story of Congress doing the job that we were elected to do by the families of our States and the communities we represent.

The Simcakoski family called on us to stand up for our brave men and women in uniform, and we took action. For more than a year, I have worked across the aisle with Senator CAPITO and leaders of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee to advance my reforms in the Senate. The House of Representatives did their part by moving forward with a House companion measure based on our bill. When it came time for my colleagues to agree on the final package that we have before us today, I worked with the Simcakoski family to ensure that it reflected the strongest possible response to the opioid overprescribing and pain management problems at VA.

I thank my colleagues—particularly the 20 Senators who cosponsored the bill—for their work and help in passing the Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act today.

I thank my partner in this bipartisan endeavor, Senator SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO of West Virginia.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman ISAKSON and Ranking Member BLUMENTHAL and their staffs for their commitment to combating opioid abuse at the VA.

I thank Leader REID and Senators MURRAY, SCHUMER, LEAHY, WYDEN, ALEXANDER, and all the members of the conference committee for their steadfast support of these reforms. And importantly, I want to thank and recognize all of their staffs and my staff for their tireless work through late nights and weeekends to get this bill to the finish line.

This legislation is informed by the collaborative efforts of a broad range of outside health and veterans organizations, and I am grateful for their expert contributions.

I cannot forget the incredible work of Senate legislative counsel—specifically

Tom Heywood for his expert drafting, redrafting, and redrafting, and technical expertise on this bill.

Today we send major veteran reforms—my Jason Simcakoski Opioid Safety Act—to the President's desk for his signature. I am proud that Congress put aside differences and joined together to help fix what has been broken and help restore the sacred trust with our veterans and their families.

The Simcakoski family has inspired us by showing tremendous courage and strength in sharing their tragic story of loss and in working to make a difference in the lives of other veterans and their families. I believe that today's passage of the Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act marks one of Congress's great accomplishments—to provide our veterans and their families with the care they have earned and deserve.

My closing message comes from Jason's widow Heather. Heather said:

When I look back at the past, I want to know we made a difference. I want to believe we have leaders in our country who care. I want to inspire others to never give up because change is possible.

I want to say to Marv and Linda, Jason's parents; to Heather and Anaya, Jason's wife and daughter; and to Jason: Thank you for inspiring me. Thank you for demanding that we stand together to enact the strongest opioid safety reforms for veterans and their families. You have inspired true change. This change will save lives, and you have given us all hope for a brighter future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, before I talk a bit about the 1-year anniversary of the signing of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action between the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, plus Germany, with Iran, I want to take a moment to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am privileged to serve with her on the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. I have had a chance to see and witness her sincerity, her commitment, and her dedication on this front, and I commend her.

I serve with the Senator from West Virginia—not on Homeland Security but on Environment and Public Works. I commend her for her bipartisan spirit that we see here and I commend the leadership they have both shown to ensure that the right thing is done.

IRAN

Mr. President, I thank Senator COONS, my colleague from Delaware, for organizing a floor colloquy of Members to take place this afternoon to discuss the 1-year anniversary of something we call the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—or the Iran nuclear deal—that was signed literally a year ago tomorrow by the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, plus Germany, with Iran.

At this time a year ago, there were a lot of skeptics as to whether Iran would keep its part of the bargain and not go forward with developing nuclear weapons. We heard arguments that they would evade inspection and that Iran would never live up to their obligations under the agreement that we signed a year ago tomorrow. We heard that they couldn't be trusted. We heard that they would not keep their word. We heard any number of accusations and speculation. We heard that the people of Iran wished death upon America and wished to continue the antagonistic relationship with the United States that dominated U.S.-Iranian relations after the Iranian revolution.

I just want to say a year later that I believe there is good reason to believe the critics were proved wrong when Iran took those irreversible steps to dismantle its nuclear weapons program—steps that were certified by the nuclear watchdogs at the International Atomic Energy Agency. For example, national inspectors certified that Iran had reduced its stockpile of enriched uranium by 98 percent and that the remaining enriched uranium was only enriched at levels consistent with peaceful energy uses. Inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency certified that the nearly 15,000 centrifuges for enriching uranium have been dismantled, leaving Iran with only its least sophisticated centrifuges that can be used solely for peaceful purposes. The inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency have also certified that the special heavy water reactor that could produce the kind of plutonium needed for a nuclear bomb will produce no more. Inspectors saw firsthand that the core of that reactor had been filled with concrete, rendering it incapable of ever producing plutonium again. Inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency continue to assess that Iran is keeping up with its commitments in the nuclear agreement.

I have never been to Iran. I hope to go someday. But a place I have been to is Southeast Asia. I served 3 years in a war in that part of the world, with a country with which we were at war—in some cases, almost a proxy war but at war for many years, the Vietnam war. The names of 55,000 men and women are on a granite wall about 2 miles from where we are standing here today, close to the Lincoln Memorial.

When the war was over—the war was winding down—my Active-Duty tour with the U.S. Navy as a naval flight officer came to an end, and I resigned from my regular commission and assumed a Reserve commission and continued to fly with the Navy as a P-3 aircraft mission commander in the Naval Reserve for another 18 years.

The month after I retired from the Navy as captain, I was a member of the House of Representatives. I led a delegation of six of us—all Vietnam members of U.S. House of Representatives—back to Vietnam in August of 1991. We

went at a time when, even though we were not at war with Iran, there was still great animosity between our two countries. Some of that was spurred by the fact that we never found out what happened to thousands of American MIAs. They disappeared, in some cases almost without a trace. We had very little cooperation from Vietnam to try to find out the truth of their demise. There is a lot of speculation that they are being held as POWs in Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos, and there were actually photographs of people alleged to be our MIAs who were being held in captivity—we didn't know where but the assertion was in Vietnam or Cambodia or Laos.

During our congressional delegation trip in August of 1991, it turned out that the pictures that were shown on the cover of Newsweek and TIME magazine and on the front pages of newspapers across the country were not Americans; they were Soviet nationals. There was an effort by people in Cambodia—bad people—to try to extort money from the families of the American MIAs who never came home. The people in those pictures were actually Soviet nationals, not missing Americans.

During the midst of all of this back-and-forth about the MIAs from America from that war, six of us participated in a congressional delegation. We went to Vietnam. We met with the new leader of Vietnam, a fellow named Do Muoi, who became the leader in August of 1991 of the Communist Party, making him the top leader of Vietnam. We presented to him from the George Herbert Walker Bush administration a roadmap to normalize relations. This was the deal: Vietnam, if you will open up your archives, open up your war museums, allow us to explore, excavate crash sites, have free movement around your country to see if Americans respond or people believed to be Americans respond—if you will do all those things, we will reciprocate, and we will move toward normalized relations with your country.

There was a lot of lack of faith on the sides of both countries, Vietnam and us. The Vietnamese were fearful that we would move the goalposts, that even if they did all the things they were required to do under the roadmap to normalize relations, we would move the goalposts and still not normalize relations. For our part, there was concern that they would never do those things anyway, so why should we bother.

At the end of the day, we engaged with the Vietnamese, and they engaged with us. They did the things they were supposed to do, and we did as well. We normalized relations about 4 years later.

John Kerry and JOHN MCCAIN did good work in the Senate. Our delegation did good work in the House. The George Herbert Walker Bush administration passed the baton to President Clinton, and normalized relations were

established about 4 years later. The first U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam was a member of our delegation, former POW and former Air Force pilot Pete Peterson.

Fast-forward about 25 years later, a month and a half ago, President Obama was nice enough to invite me to join him on a trip to Vietnam, along with a couple of Congressmen. A lot changed in those 25 years. Today the United States of America is Vietnam's top export market. Today Vietnam is part of the 12-member transpacific trade partnership we are endeavoring to establish and get approved here and in 11 other countries.

While we were over there a month and a half ago, the Vietnamese announced an \$11 billion deal with Boeing. They are going to buy 100 737 jets valued at \$11.3 billion from Boeing. They announced that they are going to buy from Pratt & Whitney—a big aircraft engine company—another \$3 billion worth of engines to put in 63 Airbuses.

The President lifted the ban on arms sales to Vietnam, and a lot of other announcements were made. While we were over there, we learned that a survey of the Vietnamese people done earlier that year indicated that 84 percent of the Vietnamese people had a favorable opinion of the United States. Another survey indicated that 95 percent of the Vietnamese people have a favorable opinion of the United States. They like us more in Vietnam than we like us.

Meanwhile in Iran, Iran is not unlike Vietnam—a young nation. There are about 78 million people who live in Iran. More than half of them are under the age of 25, and they have a great affection for our country. Some of the leaders do not, but many of the people do, particularly the younger people. They want a better life with us and a better relationship with us.

They have had elections since the joint agreement was agreed to, elections in their Parliament and in the Council of Experts, which elects the next Supreme Leader. The moderates, the reformers made great strides in those elections earlier this year. There were very encouraging results.

A year later, among other things that have happened, the Iranians decided they have had a hard time accessing capital to be able to purchase things—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CARPER. I request 1 more minute, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Just as the Vietnamese have finalized a large deal—the purchase of American jets—the Iranians announced about 2 weeks ago that they will be purchasing a number of 747 jumbo jets built by Boeing, 737s, 777s. The value of the deal is worth about \$17 billion over the next 4, 5, 6 years.

I would suggest to our colleagues who say we can't trust these guys that we still have problems with what they are doing with some of their missile testing. We have problems with support of Hezbollah and other terrorist groups like that. For the most part, they have kept their word on the joint deal we signed, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

We are starting to see some commerce transact between both countries that actually inure to our bottom line to strengthen the economy of this Nation.

I just want to say—is it time for us to spike the football? Is everything fine? No. Eyes wide open. That is important. Eyes wide open. Having said that, I think most fairminded people would say: So far, so good. Let's continue to be vigilant, and hopefully a year from now, the second anniversary of the signing of this joint agreement will have even better news not just for us but for the rest of the world.

With that, I thank you, Mr. President, for that extra minute.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I would like to start my remarks on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act with a story I received from one of my constituents, David. He is a patient at Hope House in Boston. Hope House is the oldest and one of the largest residential treatment programs for adults in Massachusetts. This is what he said:

Senator Markey: Addiction has totally ruined my life. It quickly took everything from me and my family. It has stripped me of my dignity and self worth along with my self respect. I also lost the trust of my entire family.

Addiction started late for me. I was 44 years old. I had everything I could possibly dream of. A beautiful wife, a son, two stepdaughters that I raised and put through college. We also built a new home in 2000. I had a great career and was a few years away from 20 to retire.

Then my family and I went on vacation for two weeks and I came home with a parasite in my stomach for which I was prescribed pain medication. That was at the end of April that year. In May, I had my appendix taken out. In June, I had to have my gallbladder out. All the while being prescribed pain meds.

Before I knew it, I was addicted. It wasn't long after that there were no more scripts to be had. Then I was doing heroin. This was so scary for me because I had not used any drugs my entire life. Within two years, everything was gone. Wife, family, job, house. Everything.

It has been a real struggle to get out and stay clean between not being able to get a detox bed, or, if I did, after five days, only to be told that there were no beds available for further treatment. Which meant back on the street to start the whole process over again.

I finally did make it to the Hope House, which I am so grateful for. I know I am going to make it this time; I just feel it. Thank you for the chance.

I pray for David and all the patients at Hope House. They found the help they needed, and we hope they will

have the strength and the support to achieve long-term recovery.

I am proud that this opioid legislation contains provisions of the TREAT Act—The Recovery Enhancement for Addiction Treatment Act—a bill I introduced with Senator RAND PAUL of Kentucky and other colleagues here in the Senate. The TREAT Act addresses the demand side of the opioid epidemic.

I firmly believe that if we are going to reduce the supply of heroin, fentanyl, and illicit prescription drugs, we have to reduce the demand through treatment. But for far too long, outdated and scientifically unsound Federal restrictions have severely limited access to effective medication-assisted treatment like Suboxone for opioid addiction. The TREAT Act removes these restrictions. Importantly, the TREAT Act would allow appropriately trained nurse practitioners and physician assistants to treat patients with these lifesaving therapies.

These TREAT Act provisions, which are included in the CARA conference report, will increase access to treatment, especially in community health centers and rural communities across this country. I am grateful that these provisions are included in the bill we will vote on today. I am hopeful they will have an impact in the future.

It has been a long haul and hard work over the last few years, but we have achieved a measure of success that will impact lives as soon as this bill is signed into law. I sincerely thank Senator MURRAY and Senator ALEXANDER for their support on the TREAT Act. I thank Senator HATCH and Representatives PALLONE and UPTON and all the CARA conferees who worked to get the TREAT Act provisions included in this final package we are voting on today. I would like to express my appreciation to Senators WHITEHOUSE and PORTMAN and all of the Senate and House cosponsors of the TREAT Act who supported efforts to get the law changed so that more people can get the treatment they need.

In Massachusetts, I am hearing enormous frustration from people who don't feel that adequate resources are being brought to bear on this enormous epidemic of prescription drug and heroin addiction. Just like David, countless people suffering from addiction cannot find a bed for detox, and then when they are at their most vulnerable moment in recovery, they cannot find a place or provider of long-term treatment.

For the months that we have been debating CARA in this Chamber, we have heard the statistics. Our Nation is experiencing more deaths from drug overdoses than from gun violence or auto deaths. Eighty percent of people suffering from heroin addiction started on opioid pain medications approved by the Food and Drug Administration and prescribed by doctors who aren't required to receive education on safe opioid prescribing.

Nearly 30,000 people in the United States died of an opioid overdose in

2014. Approximately 1,300 of those were in Massachusetts. Of those 1,300, 754 had fentanyl in their system. Massachusetts is 2 percent of America's population. If you multiply 754 times 50, you are up to 37,000 people dying from fentanyl in our country. That is like having a war in Korea every single year. We haven't even begun this battle on fentanyl. But it is coming, and it is coming with an urgency that is very difficult to even imagine. The total deaths from opioids in America would be equivalent to a Vietnam war every single year, and fentanyl is 50 times more powerful than morphine—unbelievable. That is how powerful it is—50 times more powerful.

This is just something that we are going to have to deal with, and approximately 2.5 million Americans abused or were dependent on opioids in 2012, but fewer than 1 million received treatment for their condition. Out of the 2.5 million people who needed help, only 1 million got it in our country. We are being overwhelmed by a tsunami of heroin, prescription drugs, and fentanyl addiction, and we must stop it before it drowns any more families in our country.

We had an opportunity here to make sure we put real funding into this bill for more treatment. We are not going to meet that challenge here today. We do need funding for those families—funding for treatment providers who help put people on the path to recovery and funding for our sheriffs, firefighters, and other first responders who carry the overdose prevention drugs that save lives. We need funding for the public education campaign so that we can prevent addiction before it takes hold. We will not save lives and stop this scourge of addiction unless we, in fact, ensure that there is full funding for treatment. We will save lives with more treatment options, more Narcan, more counselors, more education, more beds, and a better continuum of care, but we must fund it.

The bill we are voting on today is a good step, but we still have much further to go. Without that funding, this effort will not do the full job that our country wants us to do. Our cities are fighting a war, and we need to help them. We are hemorrhaging lives by the day. If we are to staunch the flow of suffering and death, we desperately need funding to implement all of the programs in this bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are at a defining moment in our national discussion to address the public health crisis of addiction. Our work doesn't stop here. It has only just begun. Let's be clear. Stopping the overprescription of opioid pain medication that is fueling addiction and overdoses starts with the prescribers. We need to require anyone who prescribes opioid pain medication and other controlled substances to undergo mandatory training on safe prescribing practices and the identification of possible substance use disorder.

We need to make sure that people who enter the judicial system don't ar-

bitrarily have their Medicaid coverage terminated, making it more difficult to access treatment once they are released and fueling, once again, the vicious cycle of incarceration.

We need to make sure that all opioids approved by the Food and Drug Administration are first reviewed by independent experts to ensure that these drugs are not only safe and effective but also won't continue to fuel the epidemic of addiction in this country.

We need to make sure that prescription drug monitoring programs are fully utilized and nationally interoperable in order to prevent doctor shopping, and we must let Big Pharma know that their army of lobbyists on Capitol Hill will be matched by an army of advocates that work every day to raise awareness and save lives.

The Congress has an opportunity to let all those struggling with addiction know that help is on the way. We know that we have heard their stories, and we will not forget them.

We must let them know that no matter how dark life seems right now, there is hope, and sunlight will grace them once again, and this Chamber has not finished this job—this journey—that we must be on with every family in our country. Substance abuse is a crisis the likes of which we have never seen in America. A decade from now people will ask: What did you do to help end this epidemic? That is why I stand today congratulating all of those who worked on this bill, and we must also pledge to continue to stand up and fight for the funding and other investments we need to make.

We must stand united to end this crisis of addiction in our communities now and for generations to come so that children will not have to look to the history books to find that there ever was a year like 2016 with an epidemic that is raging across the country.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—92

Alexander	Feinstein	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Murphy
Baldwin	Flake	Murray
Barrasso	Franken	Nelson
Bennet	Gardner	Paul
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Peters
Booker	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Reed
Boxer	Heinrich	Reid
Brown	Heitkamp	Risch
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Cantwell	Hirono	Sanders
Capito	Hoeven	Schatz
Cardin	Isakson	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Cassidy	King	Shelby
Coats	Kirk	Stabenow
Collins	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Coons	Lankford	Tester
Corker	Leahy	Thune
Cornyn	Manchin	Tillis
Cotton	Markey	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Udall
Cruz	McCaskill	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Enzi	Mikulski	Wyden
Ernst	Moran	

NAYS—2

Lee Sasse

NOT VOTING—6

Cochran Roberts Sessions
Inhofe Rounds Wicker

The conference report was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VENUE ACT

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak in support of legislation I introduced, the Venue Equity and Non-Uniformity Elimination Act, or VENUE Act, that addresses patent venue reform.

Patents are an important part of our economy and are vital to promoting innovation and spurring growth, but the patent system is at risk. There is an ever-increasing problem of patent lawsuits brought by nonpracticing entities, also known as patent trolls. This problem is exacerbated by plaintiffs being able to handpick friendly judicial venues that are otherwise unrelated to the alleged infringement. An article in the Harvard Business Review states that “patent trolls cost defendant firms \$29 billion per year in direct out-of-pocket costs” and “in aggregate, patent litigation destroys over \$60 billion in firm wealth each year.”

It is clear these types of abuses impose substantial costs on the economy and simply cannot be ignored any longer.

Additionally, according to a 2013 White House patent report, the bulk of

patent troll suits target small and investor-driven companies. This is a real threat to innovation.

The VENUE Act addresses this issue and ensures that patent cases are litigated where there is a connection to the patent dispute. Under the VENUE Act, in order for a case to be properly litigated, it must be brought where either, No. 1, the defendant has a principal place of business or, No. 2, the alleged infringing act occurred or, No. 3, where the inventor conducted research and development that led to the patent.

In addition to the provisions relating to proper venue, the VENUE Act provides a more streamlined avenue for those seeking review of erroneous venue determinations. I believe my legislation strikes the right balance for determining when venue is proper, but I also understand that addressing venue is just one piece of the puzzle when we are talking about overall patent reform.

There are a number of ways patent reform can be achieved, and that is why I support the principles of the PATENT Act and believe it goes a long way in combatting this growing problem. The PATENT Act includes much needed reforms, such as fee shifting, heightening pleading standards, and customer stays that would provide relief to retailers, small businesses, and startups that are constantly under assault by these nonpracticing entities.

I commend Chairman GRASSLEY for ushering that legislation out of the Judiciary Committee. However, one piece missing from that comprehensive package is venue reform. Such a reform was included in the House version of the patent bill, and I believe it needs to be added to the Senate bill as well. All one has to do is look at the numbers and the problem surrounding venue becomes clear.

In 2009, 9 percent of all U.S. patent cases were filed in one particular Federal district. By comparison, in 2015, that number increased to just over 44 percent. That is an increase of over 400 percent. Again, the increase went from 9 percent in 2009 to 44 percent in 2015. In addition, of the cases brought in that Federal district in 2015, 95 percent of those cases were brought by nonpracticing entities. Such a distortion in case distribution is problematic, especially when the venue has no real connection to the alleged infringement at issue.

One hope for relief was the Federal circuit case in TC Heartland, but after the court’s decision on April 29 declined to impose more stringent venue restrictions in patent cases, it appears judicial relief will have to wait. Therefore, this decision has only made the need for congressional action on venue even more important. I hope it will bring renewed attention to patent venue reform and the VENUE Act in the Senate.

While there are a number of solutions to the overall patent troll problem,

venue reform is of the utmost importance and must be central to any larger reform effort.

I urge my colleagues to support the reforms contained in the VENUE Act, and I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

INVESTIGATION INTO ALLEGATIONS OF FBI-FACILITATED RANSOM PAYMENTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about allegations that the FBI has facilitated ransom payments to terrorist groups. Unfortunately, the administration has been stonewalling the Senate Judiciary Committee’s investigation into the matter.

We have seen many terrible terrorist attacks recently. The government’s highest duty is to provide for national security. That means fighting the radical Islamic terrorist groups that mean us harm.

An important part of fighting radical Islamic terrorist groups is going after their funding. The U.S. Government should do everything it can to stop money from flowing to groups like al Qaeda and ISIS.

The government has had significant successes in fighting terrorist funding. Ransom payments for hostages are one of the key sources of funds for terrorist groups to raise money.

The government should not be participating in helping to make such payments. Yet, in April of last year, the Wall Street Journal reported that the FBI had helped facilitate a \$250,000 ransom payment to al Qaeda.

It was from the family of kidnapped aid worker Warren Weinstein back in 2012. That report was later confirmed by 60 Minutes in an interview with Dr. Weinstein’s widow.

Around the same time as that Wall Street Journal article, Army LTC Jason Amerine contacted Judiciary Committee staff. He is a decorated war hero who reached out to Congressman HUNTER, Senator JOHNSON, and to my office, to raise concerns about ineffective hostage-recovery efforts. He alleged that the FBI was involved in a ransom payment made in an effort to recover SGT Bowe Bergdahl.

To be clear, the U.S. Government should take all appropriate measures to recover American hostages.

But those measures cannot include ransom payments that end up funding more terrorist operations.

Ransom payments are big business for terrorist groups. According to a 2014 investigation by the New York Times, Al Qaeda and its affiliates have taken in at least \$125 million from kidnapping for ransom since 2008.

ISIS also takes in huge amounts from ransom payments. The United Nations estimated that ISIS collected between \$35 and \$45 million in ransom payments in 2014 alone.

This is a serious threat to our national security.

In 2012, David S. Cohen, who was the Treasury Department's Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence at the time, explained why in a presentation on the issue.

He said:

Ransom payments lead to future kidnappings, and future kidnappings lead to additional ransom payments.

And it all builds the capacity of terrorist organizations to conduct attacks.

Al Qaeda affiliates use ransom money to help fund the full range of their activities, including recruiting and indoctrinating new members, paying salaries, establishing training camps, acquiring weapons and communications gear and helping to support the next generation of violent extremist groups.

Paying ransoms incentivizes terrorists to kidnap more people, and it funds their terrorist attacks.

The administration says it is still U.S. policy for the government to deny hostage-takers the benefits of ransom. But its policy on helping others make ransom payments is murky.

If the FBI pays lip-service to the no-ransom policy by not making payments itself, but facilitates payments by others, then the financial incentive for terrorists to kidnap people remains the same.

The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over the Department of Justice, including the FBI.

The FBI's hostage-recovery efforts, including any facilitated ransom payments, must be subject to constitutional oversight by the committee.

The Justice Department has failed to fully cooperate with the committee's inquiries.

In May of last year I wrote to the Attorney General.

I asked several questions about the FBI's alleged involvement in facilitating payments to terrorist groups.

Among other things, I asked: "Has the FBI been involved in any transfer of money in connection with attempts to secure the release of hostages held by al Qaeda, the Taliban, the Haqqani network, ISIS, or associated forces?"

The Justice Department failed to respond for 5 months.

In the meantime, the President issued Executive Order 13698 and Presidential Policy Directive 30. Those established a new hostage-recovery policy as the result of an interagency review.

Then, 5 months after I sent my questions to the Attorney General, the Justice Department finally sent me a response. That response failed to answer my questions. Instead, the response just summarized the public documents released by the administration when it announced its new hostage-recovery policy.

Merely pointing to publicly available documents is not good faith cooperation with independent fact finding. So I wrote to the White House last fall.

I asked that the administration provide the committee the classified parts of the new hostage-recovery policy, PPD-30, as well as the classified part of the policy it replaced, NSPD-12. But

the administration failed to share those classified parts of the policies with the Committee.

Think about that. The FBI plays a key role in hostage-recovery efforts. The Judiciary Committee is responsible for overseeing the FBI. Yet, the administration refuses to even tell the Committee in full what its written policies say. That kind of stonewalling is unacceptable.

I referred the matter to the Inspector General for the Department of Justice last October. In February, he informed me that his office had opened an initial inquiry. That inquiry is ongoing. My investigation continues as well.

Yesterday I sent another letter to Attorney General Lynch and Director Comey seeking complete answers to my questions and complete copies of the policy documents.

If the public reports are accurate, then there is a very real possibility that the FBI has helped send millions of dollars to al Qaeda and ISIS. That money inevitably was used to help terrorists kill more innocent people.

The Judiciary committee needs all the facts to get to the bottom of this. The FBI should cooperate. The Department of Justice should cooperate. The White House should cooperate.

FBI Director Comey and Attorney General Lynch should fully respond to all the questions in my May 2015 letter.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. LORETTA LYNCH,
Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL LYNCH: I am writing in regard to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's policies and practices regarding ransom payments in hostage recovery efforts. On April 29, 2015, the Wall Street Journal, citing unnamed senior U.S. officials, reported that "the Federal Bureau of Investigation helped facilitate a 2012 ransom payment to al Qaeda from the family of kidnapped aid worker Warren Weinstein[.]" The article alleges that, although the FBI claims it did not directly approve or authorize a ransom payment, it nonetheless "vetted a Pakistani middleman used by the family to transport the money and provided other intelligence to enable the exchange." The article also quoted U.S. officials as saying that, "the family was particularly encouraged by the ransom option when the FBI said it was probably the best chance to win Mr. Weinstein's release." Another recent news article reported that the government "is reviewing its policy preventing families of hostages to pay ransom to kidnappers[.]"

In order to evaluate the FBI's policies and procedures related to ransom payments to terrorist organizations as part of hostage recovery efforts, please provide the Committee with answers to the following questions by May 15, 2015:

1. Was the FBI involved in a payment of a ransom in an attempt to recover Dr. Weinstein?

2. Did the FBI vet a Pakistani middleman for the Weinstein family to use in making a

ransom payment to al Qaeda in an attempt to recover Dr. Weinstein?

3. Did the FBI provide other intelligence to enable the ransom payment? If so, what intelligence was provided? To whom was it provided?

4. What other steps, if any, did the FBI take to facilitate the ransom payment?

5. What steps, if any, did the FBI take in preparation for a potential release of Dr. Weinstein following the ransom payment to secure his safe return to the United States?

6. What happened to the ransom money after Dr. Weinstein was not released?

7. What steps, if any, did the FBI take to secure a return of funds to the Weinstein family?

8. Has the FBI been involved in any transfer of money in connection with attempts to secure the release of hostages held by al Qaeda, the Taliban, the Haqqani network, ISIS, or associated forces?

9. What are the FBI's policies and procedures relating to ransom payments, whether by the U.S. Government or third parties, in hostage recovery efforts?

10. What audit procedures, if any, are in place to ensure FBI compliance with these policies, procedures, and all applicable law?

11. Have those audit procedures, if they exist, revealed any violation of FBI policies, procedures, or applicable law? Has the FBI otherwise learned of such violations?

12. If any violations were found, what remedial or punitive actions were taken?

13. What is the status of the FBI's current hostage recovery efforts for those hostages believed to be held by terrorist groups?

14. Is FBI facilitation of ransom payments by the families of hostages being considered as an option in those recovery efforts?

Please number your responses to match their corresponding questions. Please also provide FBI personnel to brief the Judiciary Committee on these issues after you have provided your responses, but in any event no later than May 22, 2015. If you have any questions about this request, please feel free to contact Patrick Davis of my Committee staff. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Chairman.

Mr. GRASSLEY. There is no excuse for stonewalling oversight, but it is especially inexcusable in a matter as important as this. It is shocking that the only answer the FBI can come up with to these allegations is silence. Burying our heads in the sand does not make the issue go away.

If our government is assisting in paying ransom money to terrorists, Congress needs to know, the public needs to know.

The government officials involved need to be accountable. The facts cannot be hidden from the FBI's oversight committee. The policies implementing our laws on this topic cannot be kept secret from the FBI's oversight committee.

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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING GERALD R.
SHERRATT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a remarkable public servant, humanitarian, neighbor, and friend: Gerald R. Sherratt. Jerry was the former mayor of Cedar City and the 13th president of Southern Utah University. He passed away last week, leaving behind an unparalleled legacy that will forever bless his hometown and the great State of Utah.

A man of abundant energy and unwavering enthusiasm, Jerry transformed the town of Cedar City. The fruits of his service can be found throughout the city, including the tremendous growth of Southern Utah University, the building of a new airport terminal, the success of the Utah Shakespeare Festival, the founding of the Utah Summer Games, the inception of the Livestock and Heritage Festival, the organization of the Storybook Cavalcade Parade, and the establishment of the American Children's Festival. These and so many other achievements owe their success to the leadership of Mayor Sherratt. He was truly Cedar City's most enthusiastic cheerleader and one of Southern Utah University's most cherished presidents.

Jerry served as the mayor of Cedar City for two terms, implementing groundbreaking initiatives and infusing a new energy into the city. In recognition of the world-famous Utah Shakespeare Festival, he coined the term Festival City USA to attract visitors to the city. The tourists came in droves. Over the course of his public service, Jerry oversaw the fast growth of Cedar City's neighborhoods and helped lead efforts to improve the city's transportation infrastructure at a time of increased demand. With his trademark smile and charismatic personality, he quickly became a beloved public servant who would give his all to the good of the city and its citizens.

Jerry's academic career stands on its own. He was a graduate of Branch Agricultural College, which later became Southern Utah University. He received a bachelor's degree in elementary education and a master's degree in educational administration before serving in his first leadership position at Utah State University. He would later return to his first alma mater to serve as Southern Utah University's president from 1982 to 1997. While at the helm, SUU saw the largest increase in student population and facilities in its history, setting the pace for many years to come. Perhaps one of Jerry's proudest moments came when he successfully lobbied to turn Southern Utah State College into Southern Utah University. The crowning jewel of Jerry's tenure was the building of the Centrum—a basketball arena and special events center on campus.

Jerry's contributions to the university were memorialized with the naming of Southern Utah University's Gerald R. Sherratt Library. Today the library stands as a constant reminder of

Jerry's selfless service to the university. In the library's main entryway, there is a bust of President Sherratt. As students walk in, they pay tribute to the former president by rubbing the bald head of the statue for good luck.

Jerry was delighted by this gesture. He was a good-natured man who saw the humor in having his bald head rubbed by hundreds of students as they entered the library to study each day. In addition to being a fun-loving and jovial president, Jerry was also a strong leader who was willing to roll up his sleeves and get in the trenches year after year to help his community.

Jerry loved Cedar City. He once expressed his deep emotional attachment to his community in a simple yet profound way: "These roots, they grab hold."

Our State was well served by the deep roots and leadership of this remarkable man. I will deeply miss my good friend Jerry Sherratt and the kindness and support he always extended to me throughout my service. He made an indelible impression on me and on all those who were blessed to know him. Jerry personified everything that is good about our State and its people.

TRIBUTE TO DR. HAROLD E.
SHUFFLEBARGER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to my constituent, Dr. Harold E. Shufflebarger, for his exemplary dedication to duty and service to the U.S. Navy and to the United States of America. He has spent his life serving his Nation and his community, and I would like to recognize him today.

Harold Shufflebarger was born and raised in Grayson, KY. At the age of 20, he became a Navy corpsman, serving from 1943-1945 as part of the 4th Division, 24th Marines. Dr. Shufflebarger's combat record in World War II was exemplary; in the short space of one year, he participated in four major amphibious assaults, during which his unit won two Presidential citations. In February 1944, he conducted an assault landing onto Roi-Namur Island in the northern part of the Kwajalein atoll of the Marshall Islands. From June to August 1944, Dr. Shufflebarger assaulted onto the Saipan and Tinian Islands of the Northern Mariana Islands. Harold's heroic actions culminated in the historic amphibious assault onto the island of Iwo Jima in February of 1945.

After valiantly serving his country, Dr. Shufflebarger returned home to Grayson, KY, and became a family practitioner. For over 50 years, he served as a physician in northeastern Kentucky, a region without many medical providers.

Dr. Shufflebarger has served his community throughout his life. He founded a regional radio station that won four National Association of Broadcasters Crystal Radio Awards for community service, and he served as mayor of

Grayson. Dr. Shufflebarger is a great example of the Greatest Generation putting country and community before self.

On behalf of a grateful Commonwealth and a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending Dr. Harold E. Shufflebarger for over seven decades of service to his country and to his community. We keep Dr. Shufflebarger's health in our thoughts and prayers, and we wish him; his wife, Hazel; his daughter, Alicia; his son, Eric; and his four grandchildren the best.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD AND
MAXINE HANDZIAK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a uniquely Kentuckian love story. It is a story that began in the tumult of World War II and still continues to this day, more than 70 years later. I speak of the loving relationship and marriage of Edward and Maxine Handziak, of Winchester, KY.

In 1943, America faced the Axis Powers in World War II. Many Americans bravely wore their country's uniform in the fight for freedom and democracy. Two of those Americans were native Kentuckian Maxine Hamon and her suitor Edward Handziak.

Edward was in the U.S. military and stationed in Stillwater, OK. Maxine, who had volunteered for the Women's Reserve in the U.S. Navy, was also stationed there. The two met in a chance encounter at a roller skating rink.

Edward was smitten with the young Kentuckian, and when he was sent abroad to serve in Europe he did not forget her. He wrote her letters faithfully. Even when shrapnel injured his writing hand, he wrote her with his left hand. He knew, when he returned to America, that he wanted to marry her.

As soon as the war was over, Edward came home and proposed. And it turns out that, when he fell in love with Maxine, he fell in love with her hometown of Winchester as well and longed to return. A job with Gulf Oil delayed those plans, with his career sending him all over the country. The Handziaks finally settled down in Winchester in 1985.

Today the couple has been happily married for more than 70 years, and they have three children, three grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren. Maxine's granddaughter still has her grandmother's roller skates from that fateful day when she met Edward.

I am honored to represent the Handziaks here in the U.S. Senate and want to wish them every happiness and thank them for their service. I am sure my colleagues join me in expressing gratitude for their service as well. They truly represent the finest of Kentucky.

Mr. President, an area publication, the Winchester Sun, published a compelling article on Edward and Maxine's love story. I ask unanimous consent

that said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

[From the Winchester Sun, Dec. 7, 2011]

LOVE AND WAR—COUPLE BROUGHT TOGETHER
BY WORLD WAR II SHARE STORY OF THEIR
NEARLY 70-YEAR ROMANCE

(By Rachel Parsons)

When Edward Handziak met Maxine Hamon in 1943, he fell for her right away.

Literally.

The two were at a roller skating rink in Stillwater, Okla., when Edward skated by Maxine. That also happened to be the time he lost his balance and took a spill.

"I liked to go roller skating, mainly because I liked the music they played. I was skating right along, and I fell in front of her. So, the story is, I fell for her," Edward said.

He and Maxine were both stationed in Stillwater with the United States military during World War II. Maxine and her friend Ann Marie Bush Carter were living in Winchester when World War II broke out and, after seeing their older brothers join the Navy, the two decided to join the Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service (WAVES), a division of the Navy. Maxine was 20 years old at the time.

Edward Handziak was living in Massachusetts when he was drafted at the age of 20. He and Maxine were both sent to Oklahoma A&M College, now Oklahoma State University, for training. There were numerous service men and women on the campus for specialized training at that time, Edward said.

"Stillwater was a small town, kind of like Winchester, with a movie house and a skating rink," Edward said.

Maxine was an avid skater and carried her roller skates with her wherever she traveled for the WAVES.

Her granddaughter still has the skates today.

After their initial meeting at the roller skating rink, Edward and Maxine began dating.

"I was shy and not very aggressive with girls, but with her, I skated with her the rest of the session," Edward said.

Eventually, Edward was sent overseas, fighting in Marseilles, France, to replace infantrymen training for the D-Day invasion, June 6, 1944.

Maxine was sent to Washington, D.C., for secretarial work, but Edward wrote to her every day. Because he was injured twice, the letter writing could be tedious at times, including trying to use his left hand after his right hand was hurt by shrapnel. There also was a period of time when he couldn't lie on his back, also because of shrapnel. The injuries earned him a Purple Heart with an oak leaf cluster.

"I wasn't a good letter writer," Maxine said.

When the war ended in the spring of 1945, Edward was stationed in Austria and Maxine was still in Washington, D.C. By that time, Edward knew he wanted to marry Maxine, so as soon as he was discharged, he returned home to Massachusetts and bought a ring. He went to visit Maxine in Washington, D.C., to propose, although, after 66 years of marriage, neither can recall much about that day.

"I assumed when I came back, I was going to be with her," Edward said.

Because Maxine couldn't leave her post in Washington, Edward traveled to Winchester alone to introduce himself to his future mother and father-in-law.

The Hamons lived on Lexington Road, and Edward got a taxi after arriving on the train.

He said his first introduction to small town life in the South was a conversation at Sam Reed's store on the corner of Lexington Avenue and Bloomfield Road, where the taxi driver stopped to ask directions to the Hamon home.

"Sam says to me, 'What are you to them?'" Edward said.

The story still makes him laugh, although he said that he immediately loved the town, and actually encouraged Maxine to move back there.

He also found the Hamons to be "two gracious people."

"They accepted him as if they'd known him forever," Maxine said.

The couple married at the Hamons' home after Maxine was discharged, and moved back to Massachusetts. It didn't take long, however, for Edward to start thinking about Winchester. "It seemed more progressive. There were subdivisions and everything down there, and there wasn't in New England," Edward said.

His wish to live in Maxine's hometown was granted, but only briefly. A job with Gulf Oil sent the Handziaks traveling all over the country. In 1985, they were finally able to settle in Winchester, on Churchill Drive, long-term.

"I enjoyed seeing all the places and meeting all the new people. He wanted to come back more so than I did," Maxine said.

Both Maxine and Edward say they have enjoyed their 66 years of marriage and can remember few disagreements. They have three children, Ronald, Donald and Peggy; three grandchildren; and four great-grandchildren.

"I guess I'll keep her now," Edward said.

CONFIRMATION OF CARLA HAYDEN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate confirmed Dr. Carla Hayden to be the 14th Librarian of Congress. This is an historic moment, as Dr. Hayden becomes the first woman and the first African American to serve in this important capacity. I congratulate Dr. Hayden and look forward to working with her to help the Library of Congress continue building its legacy as a great American institution.

As she assumes her new office, Dr. Hayden will be able to draw on her years of experience leading the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore. Through her leadership, the library has become more accessible to members of the community through expanded after school programs and career mentoring. As she powerfully testified during her confirmation hearing before the Rules Committee, the Enoch Pratt Free Library also served as a safe haven last summer when the city of Baltimore experienced painful unrest following the death of Freddie Gray. Her leadership has shown the transformative power of libraries, and I am optimistic that she will use that knowledge and expertise at the Library of Congress to the benefit of all Americans.

Since I received my first library card at the Kellogg-Hubbard Library in Montpelier, VT, I have loved libraries. A library is a place where everyone fits in and the possibilities are limitless. The Library of Congress occupies a special place within our country. It is our Nation's treasured repository for mil-

lions of books, photos, movies, oral histories, and music. But it should also lead by example, working to ensure that libraries keep their important place in our society and help Americans of all ages and backgrounds access information in engaging ways.

Dr. Hayden faces numerous challenges as she begins her tenure as Librarian of Congress. She must find ways to improve the Library's efforts to digitize its materials and preserve digital content. And she must find ways to improve the public's access to the Library's incredible collection through effective and responsible changes. I am committed to helping her achieve those goals.

I also encourage Dr. Hayden to work with me to promote access to government-funded research and information prepared by the Congressional Research Service, CRS. I have introduced bipartisan legislation to make CRS reports available online while respecting the important advisory role that CRS provides to Congress. The status quo—where the public can only access these reports by paying hefty subscription fees to third parties—is bad policy, and I look forward to working with Dr. Hayden to find solutions to make this meaningful resource available more broadly to schools and individual citizens.

The Library also needs Congress's assistance to reauthorize its film and sound recording preservation programs, which preserve important materials that would otherwise disappear or be destroyed through the passage of time. I have introduced bipartisan legislation to reauthorize these programs that I hope members of the Rules Committee and the Congress will strongly support. The Library's work on digitization and preservation can and should be a model for the world.

Finally, during her confirmation hearing and in follow-up questions asked of Dr. Hayden, much attention has been paid to the relationship between the Library of Congress and the Copyright Office, which has long been housed within the Library. Diverse stakeholders have called to modernize the functioning of the Copyright Office, to ensure that it, much like the Library, can best serve the public in the digital age. I hope that Dr. Hayden will serve as a helpful collaborator as I and other Members of Congress consider how to accomplish that goal. Among the most pressing issues is how best the Library's and Copyright Office's information technology, IT, systems can be improved to address widely recognized shortcomings. As Dr. Hayden takes office, I encourage her to carefully consider how to solve these problems, knowing that the two entities' IT needs may be vastly different and a solution that works for the Library's collection management may be ill-suited for the particular issues facing the Copyright Office. It is far more important that these IT issues be resolved correctly, particularly in light of the

fast-changing nature of technology, than that they be resolved quickly.

Dr. Hayden will serve as the Librarian for a 10-year term, and I am optimistic that she can accomplish great things during that time. I look forward to working together with her and once again congratulate her on this historic accomplishment.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN HONDURAS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday I made a statement about the situation in Honduras, where the March 3 assassination of environmental activist Berta Caceres remains under investigation. I also mentioned the brutal killing last week of Lesbia Janeth Urquia. In that statement, I said that Ms. Urquia was a member of the organization COPINH, which stands for the Civic Council of Popular and Indigenous Organizations of Honduras. According to information I received today, she was not a member of COPINH. However, it is my understanding that she had been active with other supporters of COPINH in opposing the construction of a hydroelectric project along the Chinacla River.

Whether Ms. Urquia's environmental activism was related to her death is a question that remains unresolved. Three suspects in the case were arrested in the past 24 hours, one of whom is reportedly her brother-in-law. According to press reports, the murder of Ms. Urquia may have been the result of a family dispute over inheritance, but the investigation is only in an early stage.

This case reminds us, again, of the unacceptable amount of violence in Honduras and the history of impunity in that country. This is a pervasive problem in each of the Northern Triangle countries, as well as Mexico. Homicides rarely result in conviction or punishment, unless there is international attention. Corruption is pervasive within the police and other public and private institutions. The courts are not as immune from political pressure as they should be. These are problems that will take years to effectively address, as they require, among other things, building professional, accountable police forces and ending the role of the military in civilian law enforcement, strengthening the Office of the Attorney General, and reinforcing the independence of the judiciary.

It also requires strong support by governments of the rights of civil society and particularly journalists, human rights defenders, and social activists who peacefully protest government policies they disagree with. This support has been notably absent in the past, and it is fundamental to any democracy.

The United States has a strong interest in helping Honduras and the other Central American countries address the culture of lawlessness that has engulfed them and in reversing the mi-

gration to the United States of desperate people fleeing violence. I welcome the assurances of top officials in those governments of the seriousness of their commitment to confront these challenges. I also know that what matters is performance.

I supported the \$750 million that Congress approved last year to implement the U.S. Strategy for Engagement in Central America and look forward to receiving the multiyear spend plan required by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, spelling out with sufficient detail and clarity the administration's plans for using those funds.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES EHLERS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont environmental advocate James Ehlers has won the prestigious 2016 Zetterstrom Environmental Award, an honor presented annually by Green Mountain Power Company. I know James well from having worked for most of the last two decades to protect and restore Lake Champlain. I have often found myself as the focus of his unrelenting vision to achieve a "swimmable, fishable, drinkable" Lake Champlain, and I agree with that vision.

Since his earliest days with Lake Champlain International, LCI, James has made it his mission to restore Lake Champlain fisheries. In recent years, James has broadened his work and the mission of LCI to also address many known and suspected lake pollutants, to prevent the spread of invasive species, and to tackle many other issues affecting the our beloved Lake, which is also known as the jewel of New England.

Named for the famed osprey advocate, Meeri Zetterstrom, the GMP-Zetterstrom Environmental Award is presented annually to one person, business, group, or nonprofit to honor a significant contribution to Vermont's environment. It is accompanied by a \$2,500 donation to the winner's environmental cause. For James, of course, that is the Lake Champlain ecosystem.

The hard work that makes this award so well-earned by Mr. Ehlers is detailed in an article published this month in *The St. Albans Messenger*.

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:

[From the *St. Albans Messenger*, July 1, 2016]

LCI'S EHLERS RECOGNIZED BY GMP

A man once called Lake Champlain's loudest advocate is being honored for his tireless devotion to Vermont's most important body of water. James Ehlers, executive director of Lake Champlain International, was presented with the GMP-Zetterstrom Environmental Award for his unwavering efforts to protect and improve Lake Champlain. The award, named for famed osprey advocate Meeri Zetterstrom, comes with \$2,500 to support LCI's work.

"As with Meeri Zetterstrom, grit, a big voice, and a thick skin are key elements of

James' environmental advocacy," said Steve Costello, a Green Mountain Power vice president who worked with Zetterstrom on osprey restoration, and presented the award. "Both made bettering the environment their life's work, and neither was put off by tough challenges. They got energized by tackling what others might think was impossible."

Zetterstrom, an elderly widow when she set out to restore endangered ospreys to Vermont in the late '80s, was a feisty visionary who took her fight to politicians, fishermen, utility executives and community leaders to build support for her effort. She exposed the danger of venturing too close to osprey nests by shooting video and sending it to local TV stations, educated schoolchildren, and ultimately inspired an effort that resulted in ospreys' removal from Vermont's endangered species list.

Like Zetterstrom, Ehlers has been an environmental advocate for decades, and has led LCI since 1999. He took LCI—little more than a Father's Day fishing derby—and turned it into a broad lake-focused environmental group with tens of thousands of supporters. The annual LCI derby has become one of the leading fishing derbies in the nation, while LCI's focus has grown to include lake-advocacy, education, cleanup and restoration.

LCI operates Lake Champlain's first and only pollution-prevention boat, removing waste from recreational boats to reduce illegal dumping. Ehlers ensured continuation of the state's lake trout and salmon restoration program by working with the Vermont Governor's Office, the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission, commissioner of the Department of Fish & Wildlife, and Senator Patrick Leahy's office. Similarly, he brought together landowners, lawmakers, scientists, and public stakeholders to effect stronger Clean Water Act rules for the benefit of Lake Champlain.

Ehlers has built a reputation as a tough, focused and effective leader. In 2010, Sen. Leahy lauded Ehlers' efforts following a federal appropriation to help the lake. He said, "Your work at Lake Champlain International has been instrumental in securing the future of Lake Champlain. All of us who enjoy its waters every year are very grateful for your dedication. Many thanks for the work that you do."

For his part, Ehlers said he is proud of his focus on lake improvement and environmental advocacy, and honored to receive the Zetterstrom Award, but more proud of all those behind the scenes who don't get the credit they deserve for making his work possible—the volunteers, members, staff, and benefactors.

"It's an honor to receive this award from Green Mountain Power. And frankly, unexpected. I am just one member of a team—a team deeply committed to truly sustainable communities. We'll use the funds received to support our important education programs at LCI and recruit more people to the team necessary to effect real change, the transition to an economy that protects water rather than the current one predicated on its pollution. We have made gains in recent years, but it's not enough. Lake Champlain is more than a place to recreate. The lake sustains our cities with drinking water and supports habitat essential to our state's unique environment," Ehlers said. "Meeri had a vision and saw it to completion, and Vermont is better for it. Like Meeri and so many others out there, we must continue the hard work ahead to reverse the effects of centuries of pollution in Lake Champlain. This will take time, but there are important steps we can take now so that future generations will have the benefit of this critical natural resource. As Cousteau said many years ago, and it is as valid now as it was then, there is

no disconnecting the life cycle from the water cycle. If I can continue to remind people of this and motivate people to act on it, both our natural resources and our most precious resource, our children, will be better off. We are all at least 60 percent water, after all."

LCI is a federally recognized 501(c)(3) non-profit organization actively involved in shaping the future of Lake Champlain's water and fisheries health for the well-being of the people who depend on it today and tomorrow. To protect, restore, and revitalize Lake Champlain and its communities, LCI educates, advocates, and motivates to ensure that Lake Champlain is swimmable, drinkable, and fishable, understanding that healthy water resources are essential for a healthy economy and a healthy community.

The GMP-Zetterstrom Environmental Award, first presented in 2010 shortly after Zetterstrom's death, was created to honor her legacy and recognize others who follow her example. Past award recipients include Sally Laughlin, a leading wildlife advocate and scientist whose work was instrumental in restoring three species of endangered birds in Vermont; Michael Smith, the founder of Rutland's Pine Hill Park; Margaret Fowle, who leads Vermont's peregrine falcon restoration program; the Lake Champlain Committee, which for five decades has used science-based advocacy, education and collaboration to protect and improve Lake Champlain; and Kelly Stettner, who founded the Black River Action Team, which protects the Black River in southeastern Vermont; and Roy Pilcher, co-founder of Rutland County Audubon.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR PETER WESTMACOTT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I wanted to share with my friends in the Senate some news from across the pond. Sir Peter Westmacott, who served as British Ambassador to the United States from 2012 until January of this year, was recently bestowed the high honor of Knight Grand Cross of the Order of Saint Michael and Saint George for his services to British diplomacy. In other words, Sir Peter is now a "super knight."

Sir Peter has served British diplomatic interests at home and abroad for decades. His commitment and dedication to peaceful cooperation in the international community is unparalleled. Sir Peter first came to Washington, DC, as Counsellor for Political and Public Affairs in Washington, a position he held from 1993 to 1996, after which he returned home to serve as Director for the Americas at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

From 2002 to 2006, Sir Peter Westmacott served as Her Majesty's Ambassador to Turkey. His experience and unwavering commitment to diplomacy were instrumental as he navigated difficult and tragic waters following the November 2003 terrorist attack on the British Embassy in Turkey. He also fostered diplomatic discussions surrounding Turkey's candidacy as a member of the European Union. Beginning in 2007, Sir Peter served as Her Majesty's ambassador to France, where he promoted diplomacy, trade, and investments between France and the U.K.

During his time as Her Majesty's Ambassador to the United States, Sir Peter worked tirelessly to maintain and strengthen U.K.-U.S. relations and to promote diverse and inclusive cultures. His long career illustrates his deep belief in unity and that we, as nations, can accomplish more together than we could dream of achieving alone.

Marcelle and I are lucky to count Peter Westmacott and his wife, Susie, among our friends and are proud of him for earning this prestigious honor. I wanted to share with the Senate the full citation from the Queen's 2016 Birthday Honours for Diplomatic Services: "Peter Westmacott has successfully and relentlessly pursued British interests at the highest levels of international diplomacy, including over the last ten years through three important relationships for the UK—the USA, France and Turkey. He has used every aspect of modern diplomacy—political, prosperity, soft power and leadership—to deliver high impact outcomes for the UK. In each of these most recent roles he has faced difficult challenges to deliver for the UK whether it be deepening the bilateral relationship at the highest levels or persuading partners to work with the UK on difficult issues. He has been one of the UK's leading and most accomplished British Ambassadors of his generation."

I thank Peter and Susie for their many achievements and dedication to strengthening the special relationship between the United States and United Kingdom.

FAA CONTRACT TOWER PROGRAM

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I want to applaud the passage of the Federal Aviation Administration FAA Reauthorization, as it strengthens security, provides for critical aviation infrastructure, and maintains access to affordable travel for Montanans as well as the rest of the country. However, while many important provisions were addressed in the FAA reauthorization, improvements to the Federal Contract Tower Program that I advocated for were not included.

There are currently 253 airports in 46 States that participate in the Contract Tower Program, including three airports in my home State of Montana. The Contract Tower Program is a prime example of a successful government-industry partnership and provides safety and air traffic efficiency benefits to airports across our country.

The Bozeman, Kalispell, and Missoula airports in Montana count on the Contract Tower Program to provide essential and cost-effective services. That is why I introduced an amendment in the Senate passed FAA reauthorization bill that would protect contract towers and require the FAA to respond to airports when additional control staff and hours are needed. Unfortunately, this 14-month FAA authorization extension legislation does not

include this broadly supported provision.

Congress must take seriously the management of taxpayer dollars, and be good stewards of such. The Contract Tower Program is a clear example of a cost-efficient program that provides essential safety services. In fact, according to FAA statistics, towers in this program are responsible for 28 percent of air traffic and utilize only 14 percent of total funding.

Montanans are fully aware of the need for safe and reliable transportation services. They are also all too aware of the wasteful and careless spending by our Federal Government. Ensuring the Contract Tower Program is fully utilized is a commonsense solution that addresses both of these issues. I call on my Senate colleagues to join me in supporting this vital program.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the importance of recognizing the reality of climate change.

The truth is that manmade climate change is real. This past May was the planet's warmest May in the 136-year history of weather records. In fact, the last 13 months in a row all set world records for hottest average temperatures. Last year was the planet's hottest recorded year, and the last two decades include the 19 hottest years on record. Sea levels rose 7 inches in the last century. And, since the beginning of the industrial era, the acidity of the oceans has increased by 26 percent, which could destabilize the food chain.

My own home State of California is seeing firsthand the effects of higher temperatures and changing precipitation patterns. We are in the midst of an epic drought, which scientists say has been made 15–20 percent worse due to human-induced changes in the climate. This has made a drought into a disaster. The wildfires in California are made even more terrifying by the hot, dry conditions. And the fire season now lasts 75 days longer than just 10 years ago, resulting in more and larger fires.

As urgent as this issue is, it is not a surprise. We have seen these changes coming from a long way off. Scientists employed by the oil company Exxon were warning the company's leadership about climate change as early as 1977, writing that: "There is general scientific agreement that the most likely manner in which mankind is influencing the global climate is through carbon dioxide release from the burning of fossil fuels."

Even before that, White House scientific advisers first cautioned about climate change in 1965, explaining that carbon dioxide from fossil fuels would "almost certainly cause significant changes" and "could be deleterious from the point of view of human beings."

And as far back as 1956, the New York Times reported early evidence connecting climate change with greenhouse gases from fossil fuel combustion. That prescient article concluded with a sad commentary: "Coal and oil are still plentiful and cheap in many parts of the world, and there is every reason to believe that both will be consumed by industry as long as it pays to do so."

Despite the overwhelming scientific evidence, many in the Senate refuse to accept that climate change is caused by human activity. During the Keystone Pipeline debate at the end of 2014, a majority of Senators revealed they were in denial about climate change. Over the course of three votes on resolutions concerning climate change. All but one Senator could agree that climate change is "real." However, only 14 Republican Senators agreed that human activity contributes to climate change, and only five of those Republican Senators would agree that human activity significantly contributes to climate change. This denial of the link between our greenhouse gas emissions and climate change makes political action very difficult.

Several of my colleagues have spoken about organizations and industries that have actively contributed to the political denial of climate change. These coordinated campaigns to obscure the facts and defeat legislative solutions have succeeded in delaying action.

However, whether we act now to forestall the worst changes or we are forced to react to the refugees and the floods and the fires after the fact, there is no escaping that we must reckon with the reality of climate change.

Fortunately, we have already demonstrated that political progress is possible. For example, California has implemented several policies to address the problem, including a cap-and-trade program to return statewide emissions back to their 1990 levels by 2020, a renewable portfolio standard requiring 50 percent renewable electricity by 2030, regulations to double energy efficiency by 2030, a low-carbon fuel standard to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation fuels at least 10 percent by 2020, and a program to reach 1 million zero-emission vehicles by 2020.

Here is the thing: Even as California is implementing these policies, the State continues to grow. The State's economy grew by 2.8 percent last year, and unemployment was reduced by 1.3 percent. Both of those figures are better than the national average.

Combating climate change will grow our national economy; ignoring the reality will only weaken it. We will all be forced to recognize the reality of climate change sooner or later. The faster we act, the easier it will be to avoid catastrophic disasters, disruptions, and dislocations.

This problem requires the sincere, informed collaboration individuals, businesses, and every level of government.

It is hard to undertake such a collaboration, however, when well-financed special interests dig in their heels, and place profits over the public's needs.

We are out of time.

Let's end the denial of climate change and start building sustainable energy, water, and transportation infrastructure. This transformation will be good for our businesses and communities, and it is what the next generation needs.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Farm Credit System and to recognize the important contributions of the Mid Atlantic Farm Credit to Delaware's farmers and communities.

When President Woodrow Wilson signed the Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916, he created a robust and reliable source of credit for American farmers and ranchers that would come to serve our rural communities for a century. Since its founding, the Farm Credit has supported farming operations large and small and served as a lifeline for farmers in the face of tremendous hardships—including the Great Depression, the Second World War, and the farm crisis of the 1980s.

Today, the Farm Credit System supports farmers and ranchers with a wide variety of financial services, including crop insurance, appraisal service, life insurance, and the leasing of farm-related vehicles. By providing farm operations with the financial trust and support they need to get up and running or survive and thrive through difficult times, the Farm Credit System has been crucial to the ongoing success of our farmers, rural communities, local economies, and national agriculture sector. The partnership of the Farm Credit System with communities across the Nation throughout the last century has helped to build our country's vibrant and thriving agriculture sector.

Across the country, the Farm Credit System continues to do a great deal of good for the farmers and farm families who need help the most, ensuring that farmers who are young, beginners, or own a small plot have the financial footing they need to embark on the difficult yet rewarding experience of starting their own farm operation. By supporting organizations such as 4-H and the Future Farmers of America, the Farm Credit System is working to make a brighter future for our farmers in the generations to come.

In Delaware, farms and communities rely on the Mid Atlantic Farm Credit for those essential services. With 17 branches across Delaware and our neighboring States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, the Mid Atlantic Farm Credit supports over 11,000 members and today has more than \$2.5 billion in outstanding trust. The folks there have made a great impact on the

communities they serve, providing scholarships, sponsorships, and their own interactive educational learning system to continuously support the families and businesses they work with. The Mid Atlantic Farm Credit's dedication and commitment to their customers goes above and beyond their responsibilities in agriculture credit and funding.

I am delighted and honored to recognize the Mid Atlantic Farm Credit and the Farm Credit System, which for the past 100 years has helped meet the credit and financial service needs of rural communities and allowed American agriculture to flourish in Delaware and across these United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE WYOMING AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, it is a privilege to recognize the Wyoming Air National Guard as it celebrates its 70th anniversary.

The Wyoming Air National Guard boasts a legacy of service that spans decades—and generations. Since its formation, dedicated men and women from communities throughout Wyoming have provided essential support to our State, Nation, and world during times of trial. This rich history illustrates Wyoming's devotion and commitment to serving our Nation.

The Wyoming Air National Guard was organized in Cheyenne on August 10, 1946, and designated the 187th Fighter Group. Three years after formation, the 187th was tested. During the Great Blizzard of 1949, the Guard took to the air to aid stranded ranchers, travelers, and residents in central and southeastern Wyoming. Operations Snowbound and Haylift included more than 200 flyovers to provide much-needed supplies, such as food and medicine, to those stranded below. In addition, members of the 187th provided over 550 tons of hay to livestock.

The members of the Wyoming Air National Guard have provided mission support in nearly every national military campaign. During the Korean conflict, Wyoming pilots served around the world in Germany, Japan, and South Korea, flying over 1,500 combat missions.

The Guard also served valiantly in the face of other major military conflicts. In 1953, under the threat of nuclear war, the 187th Fighter Group was redesignated as the 187th Fighter Interceptor Squadron. The squadron's members trained relentlessly and routinely executed 5-minute simulation drills to prepare for attacks from Russian bombers.

During the Vietnam war, the Air Guard flew combat zone missions in Southeast Asia. In 1966, the group was designated as the 153rd Military Airlift Group and later as the 153rd Aeromedical Airlift Group. Throughout the grueling conflict, Wyoming airmen flew dangerous missions through rough

terrain to move wounded and fallen soldiers from the battlefield. Remarkably, no Wyoming Air National Guard lives were lost during the war.

During Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield in the early 1990s, the men and women of the 153rd supported the war effort by transporting troops and supplies within the U.S. and in Central and South America. The Guard's medical personnel were activated and sent to Saudi Arabia and were later sent to aid the Kurdish people in Iraq during Operation Provide Comfort.

The terrorist attacks of 9/11 drastically changed America. The Wyoming Air National Guard was the first unit to resume flying. In addition to transporting blood donations around the western United States, the 153rd Airlift Wing was deployed in support Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. In total, the Wyoming Air National Guard has deployed personnel abroad more than 3,700 times since 2001.

Today the Wyoming Air National Guard continues to be known for its outstanding versatility and integrity. Members remain actively involved in a wide range of missions in Wyoming, the United States, and around the world. These operations include providing humanitarian aid, supplies, and transportation for servicemembers. Additionally, the 153rd Airlift Wing provides antiterrorism support worldwide.

The heroes of the Wyoming Air National Guard proudly offer aid and support to our friends and neighbors at home. One crucial mission, especially in the Western United States, is firefighting. In 1976, two aircraft were outfitted with the Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System, beginning a long history of exceptional firefighting deployments. MAFFS has become an essential tool in our Nation's efforts to battle forest fires. In 40 years, the Guard unit has helped extinguish fires from Washington to Arizona, including the historic 1988 Yellowstone National Park fire and the 2007 wildfires in California.

The Wyoming Air National Guard continues to maintain the highest levels of integrity and reliability whenever and wherever they are called to serve. These dedicated men and women routinely pause their own lives to stand tall in the face of danger. Our State commends these heroes—and those who came before them—for all they have done to protect our most cherished ideals.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Wyoming Air National Guard's 70 years of courage, commitment, and dedication.

TRIBUTE TO JO ANN EMERSON

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Jo Ann Emerson for her tireless dedication and service to both her State and her country. I had the pleasure of serving with Jo

Ann in the House of Representatives. She has always been well-respected by her constituents, her colleagues in Congress, and the many individuals and families whose problems she dealt with as if they were her family. When Congresswoman Emerson left the Congress, she became the CEO of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, NRECA. She worked hard across the country for the kinds of communities and families she understands so well in our State of Missouri.

It would be difficult for me to convey just how great an impact she has always had on those she encountered better than the remarks made by Jeffrey Connor, interim CEO, on June 13 at the NRECA summer board meeting.

I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today marks the end of Jo Ann's tenure as CEO of NRECA, and there is so much for which to thank her.

Jo Ann has not walked through the doors of this building since July 29th of last year—46 weeks ago.

And I have said it many times since then: We miss our leader, but we have not lacked for her leadership. Jo Ann's influence on NRECA, our staff members, the work we do and the privilege of serving our membership—those things remained at the core of our mission—even in her physical absence.

Jo Ann and I would start each day with five minutes to reflect on the events of the day before and to contemplate the day ahead. And I still make time for that five minutes every day, for her counsel and guidance, to let her remind me what is truly important in our work.

NRECA has been through an incredible amount of change, with Jo Ann leading the charge, joyfully.

Jo Ann has made a remarkable difference in the partnership between NRECA and our members. She enhanced our reputation in Washington DC. And she brought with her: openness to new ideas, an appetite for innovation, transparency and a highly-involved, very personal approach.

It's remarkable to me that this organization is so different after just three years, and that Jo Ann accomplished that internal change even as she spent so much time out with our membership. She was everywhere at once.

And she worked constantly. She was available all the time, accessible for any reason, to any individual on our team or in our membership. She was "Always On."

I've been fortunate to see that selfless work ethic in action from the time I joined Jo Ann's congressional staff in 2003.

She made decisions with the Three C's in mind and in order: Her Conscience, Her Constituents, and Her Caucus.

She fought for every job in the district. She fought for the cost of every prescription drug. She fought for every inch of four-lane highway. She fought for every veteran who needed to see a specialist, every expectant mother who needed a home nursing visit for pre-natal care. She fought for every flood and tornado victim. She fought for every man and woman called to active duty in the armed services.

Her conscience demanded that she represent the members of her community, regardless of how they voted or even if they voted. She represented her whole constitu-

ency. No matter how cantankerous. No matter how poor. No matter how rural.

It is safe to say, and I think you know this too, that Jo Ann Emerson did not choose politics. Politics chose Jo Ann Emerson.

Even her campaign slogan reflected her personal morality. Election after election, it was, "Putting People Before Politics." And it made her a beloved leader as a member of Congress.

"Work Days with Jo Ann" in the district is one of the best examples of how she would stand shoulder to shoulder with her constituents. Of course, for Work Days, Jo Ann chose to call the cattle auction at the sale barn, deliver UPS packages, serve customers from the drive-through window at McDonald's, and read the St. Louis Cardinals report on the local sports radio station.

Perhaps there were four C's: Conscience, Constituents, Caucus, and Cardinals.

Any way you describe her, the key to Jo Ann is her perspective. When Jo Ann came to NRECA, she did so with a great perspective on our membership. It was almost as though she had gone from one congressional district in southern Missouri to a bigger one—with 42 million people in it. She knew exactly what to do, and she went right to work.

Within six months, she had been up in a bucket truck, shot an advocacy advertisement for a national audience, opened up Facebook and social media to the staff, started a strategic planning process, coined the term Co-op Nation, and laid down a challenge to submit 1 million comments to the Environmental Protection Agency on the Clean Power Plan.

I bet I've heard Jo Ann say this a million times: Perception is reality. It's usually my "reality" being generally overruled by her perception of it.

Jo Ann uniquely understands the importance of NRECA to our members, the reason we exist. She appreciates the essential partnership between NRECA and the communities we serve.

If there is one way to summarize Jo Ann's contribution here, it is to say that—at a critical moment in our history—she changed NRECA's perception of the world and the world's perception of NRECA, and therefore she changed our reality.

And so she lifted the NRECA International Program into a position of prominence with our members and in Washington. She began to build the reputation of NRECA around it.

Jo Ann re-energized our communications channels and gave our members a fresh voice in Washington. She tackled member engagement from the ground up. She re-organized our approach to the experience we offer to NRECA members.

She relished walking up to a member and asking—point blank—what do you think we can do better at NRECA?

She understood that doing right is always more important than being right. She challenged us to work collaboratively. She made it possible for us to fail, and then showed us what we could learn from failure. She opened the doors to the CEO office, and she would sit and listen for a minute with anyone who asked for her time. Anyone.

Even small changes in perception make a big difference, though, like the annual picnic we will enjoy this evening where the NRECA Board members and the Arlington staff, interns and contractors will have a chance to share a meal and fellowship.

Hers has been a short chapter in NRECA's long history, but it is a most important one.

We can thank Jo Ann for helping us realize the exciting possibilities for a united, well-informed, ambitious and innovative membership. For peeling back the layers of NRECA in order to show our members that we are an organization full of leadership. For leading

us to a heartfelt mission of service. And for showing us how to do our work energetically, humbly, and, as only she could, joyfully.

This is a different organization thanks to Jo Ann Emerson. It is stronger yet more flexible. It thinks and communicates differently. It possesses a greater degree of self-awareness. It remains a beacon to others.

That's her legacy: Jo Ann prepared us to expand the relationship with our many partners—relationships in which we are the trusted resource, champion the cooperative cause and inspire the future.

Today, her story joins those of the CEOs who made her leadership of this organization possible. Jo Ann would not have had this opportunity if not for the courage and vision of Clyde Ellis, Robert Partridge, Bob Bergland, and Glenn English. We all, Jo Ann included, look to a future full of promise at NRECA.

And it is our greatest hope that Jo Ann will continue to improve, and that she will have the opportunity to live a life filled with the blessings of family and the chance to reflect on her significant accomplishments and many wonderful friendships built over a career well-spent in service to others.

On her behalf, thank you for allowing Jo Ann the privilege of leading NRECA. I know—and she agrees—that this has been the highest honor of her distinguished career.

HONORING OFFICER MICHAEL KATHERMAN

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Police Officer Michael Katherman, a beloved husband, father, son, and brother who tragically lost his life in the line of duty on June 14, 2016.

Officer Katherman was born on October 18, 1981, in San Jose, CA. After graduating from Valley Christian High School in 2000, Officer Katherman played basketball at Simpson University in Redding before returning to his hometown to pursue his lifelong goal of becoming a police officer. In 2005, Officer Katherman's dream became a reality when he joined the San Jose Police Department, serving the community grew up in. After receiving the Department's Outstanding Police Duty Award in 2009, Officer Katherman became a motorcycle officer in 2015.

At a memorial service on June 21, friends and colleagues fondly recalled Officer Katherman's selfless nature and passionate commitment to his fellow police officers. He was actively involved with the Keith Kelley Club, a local organization that helps the families of law enforcement officers facing hard times, and recently participated in the annual Police Unity Tour, a bicycle ride to honor fallen officers and raise funds for the National Law Enforcement Officer's Memorial. "Mike means so much to me because he represents everything I've wanted to become: a good moral person," said his supervisor, Sergeant John Carr.

Above all else, Officer Katherman was devoted to his family and his faith. On behalf of the people of California, whom Officer Katherman served so bravely, I extend my gratitude and deepest sympathies to his wife, April;

sons Josh and Jason; parents Tom and Diane; and his brother, Nate.

300TH ANNIVERSARY OF GEORGETOWN, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the town of Georgetown, ME. One of Maine's oldest and most historic communities, Georgetown was built with a spirit of determination and resiliency that still guides the community today, and this tricentennial is a time to celebrate the generations of hard-working and caring people who have made it such a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families.

The year of Georgetown's incorporation, 1716, was but one milestone in a long journey of progress. For thousands of years, the region where the mighty Kennebec River meets the sea served as fishing grounds for the Etchemin Tribe, and the extensive shell middens and other archeological sites are today a treasure trove of this ancient history.

In 1607, the English established Popham Colony on the opposite shore of the Kennebec. This was an event of profound importance to Maine and to our Nation, as the rugged pioneers of the short-lived colony crafted the first oceangoing sailing vessel built in North America and created an industry that remains vital to the Maine economy and to our national security.

Drawn by one of the finest natural harbors in New England, English settlers arrived within a few years of the Pilgrims landing at Plymouth in 1620. The early English influence is underscored by the fact that the first deeds granted to the settlers were signed by the Etchemin Sagamore, who was called Chief Robinhood by the newcomers and whose name lives on at many points of interest throughout the community. By 1716, Georgetown was a growing town with an economy driven by fishing, shipbuilding, and lumber and grain mills. The wealth produced by the sea and by hard work was invested in schools and churches to create a true community.

Today the people of Georgetown continue to build on those traditions. Fishing and boatbuilding are mainstays of the economy. Fine inns and restaurants support a thriving tourism industry. Reid State Park, a gift to the people of Maine from Georgetown businessman and civic leader Walter Reid, offers spectacular scenery and abundant wildlife that makes Georgetown a haven for outdoor enthusiasts and artists. An active historical society, library, and volunteer fire department demonstrate the spirit of this remarkable town.

This landmark anniversary is not just about something that is measured in calendar years. It is an occasion to celebrate the people who for more than three centuries have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a community. Thanks to those who came be-

fore, Georgetown has a wonderful history. Thanks to those who are there today, it has a bright future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING HENRY DIAMOND

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a fellow Tennessean Henry Diamond, who passed away Sunday, February 21, here in Washington.

He was a champion for land and water conservation, a tireless advocate for the cause of protecting and conserving some of this country's greatest natural treasures. He had the ability and personality to work across the political spectrum with members of both parties, nongovernmental groups, State and local governments, and others.

Named by then Governor Nelson Rockefeller, Henry was one of the country's first commissioners of a newly created State environmental department. From that beginning, he left an indelible mark.

I think back to the seminal Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission some 50 years ago in which Henry played a prominent role. The commission led to the creation of our wilderness areas, wild and scenic rivers, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which has invested billions of dollars from oil and gas revenues in well over 40,000 projects all across this country.

I am reminded of his involvement some 20 years later when he created and chaired a task force that pressed for a timely review of the country's commitment to land and water conservation, which prompted President Reagan to establish the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. I chaired the commission when I was Governor of Tennessee. The commission's 1987 report called for a "prairie fire of local action" to inspire States and communities to build greenways and otherwise protect outdoor resources and provide opportunities for outdoor recreation.

And then there was his work with Lady Bird Johnson as director of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, which rallied Americans to support environmental initiatives and paved the way for an array of laws and programs Congress enacted to clean our air and water and ensure the continuing productivity of the natural resources on which our economy and our quality of life depend.

His close friendship with the Rockefeller family led to their contribution to the Nation of some outstanding landscapes in Wyoming, Hawaii, and Vermont.

After he left public service, Henry started one of the premiere environmental law firms that still bears his name, Beveridge & Diamond, where he continued to champion conservation.

Henry coauthored "Land Use in America" with another great conservation leader Patrick Noonan to take stock of our Nation's accomplishments, challenges, and new thinking in how we build communities to meet the needs of American families while protecting the lands we treasure.

In 2008, Henry Diamond helped create a task force I cochaired with our former colleague Senator Jeff Bingaman that envisioned a new day in protecting landscapes of value and fulfilling the promise of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, tying in recreation, health, education, jobs, and more. This endeavor initiated one of President Obama's signature conservation programs, America's Great Outdoors, implemented by another of our former colleagues Ken Salazar, whom the President chose as his Secretary of the Interior.

There is so much more to Henry Diamond's long and distinguished career, from chairing the National Park Service's 75th anniversary conference to serving on various boards and commissions, including Resources for the Future, the Environmental Law Institute, and the Jackson Hole Preserve.

His many contributions were recognized in 2011 when he was awarded the Interior Department's highest citizen honor, the Lifetime Conservation Achievement Award.

Henry Diamond was an exceptional lawyer, a mentor to colleagues and young conservationists, and someone many of us regularly turned to for advice and support.

We will miss him. We will miss his tireless efforts to protect the best of our Nation's natural endowment, the lands and waters that sustain us. Our condolences to his wife, Bettye, and to their family and to all who valued his friendship.

May he rest in peace.

I ask that Henry's remembrance from Beveridge & Diamond and his New York Times obituary be printed in the RECORD.●

The material follows:

[Feb. 23, 2016]

HENRY L. DIAMOND—1932–2016

We are saddened to announce the passing of one of our founders, Henry L. Diamond.

Henry was an early advocate for conservation and greatly influenced the development of environmental law in the United States. His work on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission under President Kennedy laid the foundation for the creation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and our national system of protecting wilderness areas and scenic rivers.

He later served as Executive Director of the 1965 White House Conference on Natural Beauty. This bipartisan event helped to elevate environmental issues on the national agenda in the years leading up to the establishment of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the passage of the major federal environmental legislation that guides our nation today. He was a member and Chairman of the President's Citizens Advisory Committees on Recreation and Natural Beauty and Environmental Quality.

He served as the first Commissioner of New York's Department of Environmental Con-

servations. As Commissioner, he led a 533-mile bike ride across the entire state of New York to advocate for the successful legislative passage and voter approval of the Environmental Quality Bond Act of 1972 that provided \$1.2 billion for water and air pollution control and land acquisition.

In 1975, Henry moved to the private sector, joining the nascent environmental law firm that would become Beveridge & Diamond. His practice included advising leading companies and numerous municipalities on high profile environmental matters. He also served as a mentor to many young lawyers inside and outside the firm.

While in private practice, Henry remained a tireless advocate for land and water conservation. He served on more than 30 boards and commissions, including Resources for the Future, the Environmental Law Institute, The Woodstock Foundation, The Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., and Americans for Our Heritage and Recreation. He chaired the National Park Service 75th Anniversary Conference, which produced the influential Vail Report, and co-authored the 1996 survey Land Use in America. He recently co-chaired the bipartisan Outdoor Resources Review Group, sponsored by Senators Jeff Bingaman and Lamar Alexander. The group's report, Great Outdoors America, served as a catalyst for President Obama's America's Great Outdoors initiative.

Henry's close friendship with Laurance Rockefeller over many years allowed him to facilitate some of Mr. Rockefeller's gifts to the National Park Service. These included the JY Ranch in Wyoming, additions to Hawaii's Haleakala National Park, areas in the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the establishment of the Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park in Woodstock, Vermont. His pro bono work included representing the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy in its defense of the constitutionality of rail banking.

Henry's contributions to conservation and the field of environmental law are widely recognized. In October of last year, the Environmental Law Institute (ELI) presented Henry with its Environmental Achievement Award before an audience of more than 700 environmental professionals from the private sector, government and non-profit communities. With assistance from some of Henry's "contemporaries and collaborators," we produced a brief tribute video that debuted at the ELI award dinner after warm introductory remarks from former U.S. Park Service Superintendent Bob Stanton.

In 2011, he received the Secretary of the Interior's Lifetime Conservation Achievement Award, the Interior Department's highest honor for a private citizen. He was also the recipient of Pugsley Medal of the American Academy for Park & Recreation Administration in 2008.

As Pat Noonan, founder and Chairman Emeritus of The Conservation Fund, said in the ELI Tribute video, "Henry Diamond embodies the values of public service, political insight, and private sector activity. He has blended all of those into his life's work in a remarkable mosaic that has led to the conservation field, the environmental field, and sustainability that we now have today. It's a remarkable legacy."

Earlier this year, Henry penned an inspiring charge to us all in an article in the ELI Forum entitled, "Lessons Learned for Today." Calling for a return to the spirit of the 1965 White House Conference, Henry wrote, "We must return to the spirit of that afternoon in 1965, where government-citizen cooperation, high-level leadership, and bipartisanship can again be brought to bear on today's unfinished agenda. We cannot allow complacency to take hold. There is work to be done."

As all of Henry's friends and colleagues observed throughout the years, he was renowned as a witty story teller, a master at trivial pursuit, and an iconic commentator on political talent and lack thereof. He loved biking, hiking, reading history, and listening to the oral histories of presidents and other leaders.

Henry was an exceptional lawyer, a fine mentor to his colleagues, and a devoted conservationist. We are proud of uphold the high standards and traditions of excellence he set.

Thank you, Henry.

[From the New York Times]

HENRY DIAMOND, LAWYER AT FOREFRONT OF CONSERVATION MOVEMENT, DIES AT 83

Henry L. Diamond, a lawyer who went from the vanguard of a nascent environmental movement half a century ago to become New York State's first environmental conservation commissioner, appointed by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller on the inaugural Earth Day in 1970, died on Sunday in Washington. He was 83.

His death, at a hospital there, was confirmed by his wife, Elizabeth, who did not specify a cause but said Mr. Diamond had Parkinson's disease.

Mr. Diamond may not have been a gung-ho outdoorsman in the mold of Theodore Roosevelt; he liked to bike and hike and was a frustrated gardener. In 1959, however, after he had hitched his political star to the Rockefellers instead of the Kennedys, who were also courting him, he embarked on a career in conservation and a fruitful 40-year association with Laurance Rockefeller, the Rockefeller brother whose portfolio was devoted to the environment.

At the time, in the early 1960s, "ecology was thought to be for eccentrics," Mr. Diamond recalled in a recent article in *The Environmental Forum*.

"Conservation was an afterthought on political platforms," he continued, "slightly ahead of Esperanto and a single tax."

But by 1970, the environmental movement had gathered steam, prompting activists to declare April 22 of that year Earth Day and to promote it as a day of national consciousness-raising about environmental threats.

Governor Rockefeller chose the day to sign legislation creating the State Department of Environmental Conservation and to name Mr. Diamond, at 37, to lead it, months before Congress established a comparable federal agency.

The governor went so far as to declare that people were "ready to slow down the pace of economic progress to protect the environment."

After his appointment, Mr. Diamond symbolically took to the streets to help collect litter. In the preceding years, as a protégé of Laurance Rockefeller, he had served on White House advisory panels on conservation.

As the state commissioner, Mr. Diamond biked 533 miles from Niagara Falls to his home in Port Washington on Long Island in 1972 to promote a \$1.2 billion state bond issue to pay for water and air pollution controls and to purchase and protect pristine private land.

"It has been just crazy enough to give us an invaluable amount of publicity," he said on reaching New York City.

The bond referendum passed.

During his more than three years in the job, New York was in the forefront of efforts to ban certain pesticides, eliminate polluting phosphates from detergents and protect vast swaths of the Adirondacks.

The state also became ensnarled in a controversy over Consolidated Edison's plans to build a hydroelectric plant at Storm King

Mountain in the Hudson Valley. Mr. Diamond said at the time that he had grave reservations about the plan, but he also said he had no choice but to approve a permit because his department's jurisdiction was limited to the project's impact on water quality. Environmentalists defeated the project after 18 years of legal and administrative challenges.

He resigned the post in 1973 to become executive director of the Commission on Critical Choices for Americans, a body created by Governor Rockefeller to set goals for the nation and to keep him in the limelight for a potential presidential campaign.

In 1975, Mr. Diamond joined what became Beveridge & Diamond, a Washington law firm that describes itself as the nation's largest dedicated to environmental and natural resources law. Through the firm, he advised corporations and municipalities and served on dozens of nonprofit boards and commissions.

Henry Louis Diamond was born in Chattanooga, Tenn., on May 24, 1932, a descendant of Jews from Russia and Poland who paused in their migration for a generation or so in Ireland. His father, Louis, was a shopkeeper. His mother was the former Esther Deich.

Mr. Diamond received a bachelor's degree from Vanderbilt University in 1954, served in the Army and graduated from Georgetown University Law Center.

In addition to his wife, the former Elizabeth Tatum, who is known as Betty, he is survived by their daughter, Laura Diamond Decker.

After law school, Mr. Diamond was hired as a news writer for CBS-TV in Washington. He also worked for the federal government's broadcast enterprise Voice of America. But he aimed much higher: the White House.

Interviewed by Robert F. Kennedy for a job in his brother John F. Kennedy's 1960 presidential campaign, Mr. Diamond turned him down, apparently concluding that the candidate was too young to be elected and that Nelson Rockefeller, a Republican, offered more promise. Kennedy was 43 when he was elected.

A friend later introduced him to Laurance Rockefeller, who by then was the chairman of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, an advisory panel created to review the nation's environmental challenges and recommend legislative remedies.

Mr. Rockefeller hired Mr. Diamond to edit the commission's 27-volume report, which inspired legislation to preserve the nation's wilderness and scenic rivers.

President Lyndon B. Johnson named Mr. Diamond counsel to a Citizens Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty, which was charged with drafting an environmental agenda. President Richard M. Nixon reappointed him to its successor group, the president's Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, and Mr. Diamond became its chairman.

A 1965 White House conference convened by President Johnson's citizens committee recommended strip-mining controls, bans on billboards and burying power lines.

The conference created "a bridge from traditional conservation to a new environmentalism and prompted a surge of groundbreaking legislation." Mr. Diamond wrote in *The Environmental Forum*.

In 2011, the federal Interior Department gave him its Lifetime Conservation Achievement Award.●

TRIBUTE TO BILL COORS

● Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, today I want to celebrate Bill Coors' 100th birthday, and recognize his extraor-

dinary leadership, innovation, and drive to help build the Coors Brewing Company, a great symbol of success in the State of Colorado.

Bill was born in Colorado on August 11, 1916, and went on to earn his undergraduate degree at Princeton University. After finishing his master's degree, Bill started his work at Coors and eventually became the president of the company in 1952.

The success of Coors is a direct result of Bill's impressive leadership and desire to produce only the highest quality products. Under his management, Bill advanced Coors from a regional brewery to one that was marked as a major competitor on the national stage. Known for the innovative two-piece aluminum can, implementing a program to offer customers money back on returned cans, and bolstering efforts to strengthen recycling programs, Bill demonstrated remarkable creativity and an evident desire to protect Colorado's environment.

Colorado is steeped in rich history, and Bill has without a doubt played a major role influencing that history. Bill not only helped transform Coors into a national brewery sensation but also advanced the prosperity of Colorado. Congratulations on this incredible achievement.●

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPE COD COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN'S ALLIANCE

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, fishing is a way of life on Cape Cod. But it is not always smooth sailing. That is why, in 1991, a group of Cape Cod fishermen came together to respond to the challenges facing the fishing industry in order to protect their way of life. This year, the Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance, as they are now known, is celebrating their 25th anniversary of advocating for commercial fishermen and protecting their livelihood.

A few local fishermen created what is now a nationally recognized nonprofit organization and leading voice for Cape Cod's commercial fishermen. Today the organization represents 400 independent small businesses that annually bring in over 12 million pounds of seafood worth over \$16 million. They are a vital component to the local economies of the cape towns, Cape Cod as a whole, and the entire Bay State.

These fishermen have firsthand experience at sea and understand the importance of a healthy ocean and fisheries. They have come together for 25 years to share their solutions and their successes. The Fishermen's Alliance provides an outlet for the knowledge of generations of Cape Cod fishermen to be passed to the next generation. It provides help for entrepreneurial fishermen who want to use the latest business tools to enhance their efficiency and profitability. Whether it is loans or lobster, dogfish or data, the Fishermen's Alliance provides critical sup-

port to the cape's fishing industry today and works to ensure that it has a vibrant future for many years to come.

But it is not just about Cape Cod or Massachusetts, the Fishermen's Alliance is sharing its success story with other fishing communities, too. In 2015, they published a detailed roadmap for starting a permit bank based on their experience running loan programs for groundfish and scallops. This guide will help local fishermen across the country create sustainable and successful businesses in their communities. Just as cod from the waters off the cape helped sustain America in its early years, the Fishermen's Alliance ideas can help sustain small boat fishermen around America.

The Fishermen's Alliance truly lives up to their slogan: "Small Boats. Big Ideas." They are constantly striving for a better tomorrow. They have provided my office with valuable insight and perspective for many years. Their work to create sustainable fisheries for Cape Cod and future generations of fishermen distinguishes them across this great Nation and today in the U.S. Senate. I once again congratulate the Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance on their 25th anniversary.●

REMEMBERING GARRY NEIL DRUMMOND

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of my friend Garry Neil Drummond of Birmingham, AL, who passed away on July 13, 2016. He will be long remembered as an iconic leader and skilled entrepreneur who left a positive impact on the coal and mining industry and the State of Alabama.

Garry was born in Walker County, AL. He earned a bachelor of science in civil engineering from the University of Alabama in 1961. After graduation, he joined Drummond Company, Inc., and became the first engineer hired by the company.

Garry's father, H.E. Drummond, began the Drummond Coal Company in Sipsey, AL, in 1935 to serve as a coal provider for farms and households. At age 15, Garry began working in coal mines across Walker County with his father. He was eventually named chief executive officer of the Drummond Company, and he served in this role for more than 50 years.

Garry was a founder of the American Coal Foundation, and in 1978, he served as the first chairman of the Mining and Reclamation Council of America, which later merged with the National Coal Association. Garry also served on the boards of the National Mining Association and the Alabama Coal Association.

He was a longtime member of the University of Alabama board of trustees and served as president pro tem of the board. He was also the university's "Outstanding Alumnus" for 1987-88. Garry was inducted into the Alabama

Academy of Honor in 1989, the Alabama Engineering Hall of Fame in 1997, the Alabama Business Hall of Fame in 2003, and the Birmingham Business Hall of Fame in 2010.

A dedicated civil servant, Garry served on the boards of the Big Oak Ranch, Inc., Boy Scouts of America Greater Alabama Council, the Business Council of Alabama, the Economic Development Partnership of Alabama, the Rotary Club of Birmingham, and Glenwood, Inc.

Largely due to Garry's steadfast leadership, Drummond Company today includes large coal mines in Alabama and Colombia, South America, a worldwide coal sales organization, ABC Coke—the largest merchant foundry coke producer in the United States—and a real estate division with major developments in Lakeland, FL, Palm Springs, CA, and Birmingham, AL.

Garry's many successes, accomplishments, and contributions to the State of Alabama and the coal and mining industries will not soon be forgotten. He was truly a remarkable businessman, an unwavering leader, a devoted civil servant, and a loyal friend.

I offer my deepest condolences to Garry's wife, Peggy Drummond, his four children, his large extended family, and countless friends as they celebrate his exceptional life and mourn this great loss.●

RECOGNIZING THE PURPLE ROSE THEATRE

● Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, today I wish to pay special tribute to the Purple Rose Theatre in Chelsea, MI, as the theatre celebrates its 25th season.

The Purple Rose is not just an extraordinary regional theatre; its world-class productions have inspired artists, performers, and audiences across our State and Nation.

The Purple Rose Theatre was founded in 1991 by actor and Michigan native, Jeff Daniels. Starting out in an old used car and bus garage, the theatre now features an intimate feel and authentic 1930s theatre decor.

Michigan is home to a vibrant performing arts community, and the Purple Rose is a unique gem and special part of Michigan's rich and diverse cultural fabric.

The theatre is a home for all types of artists, whether new and aspiring performers or experienced professionals. It provides new performers a place to grow and learn as they master their craft.

We are all fortunate to be able to enjoy the quality, professional productions of the Purple Rose at affordable prices.

The theatre has also been a great community partner. It offers readings and lectures through a partnership with the Chelsea District Library and has helped make Chelsea a thriving destination for the arts.

I am proud to join the theatre's leadership, sponsors, board members, art-

ists, and patrons on July 30, 2016, for the "Cue 25: Lights Up!" celebration and benefit to reflect on the past 25 years of memories and accomplishments and look forward to many more years of success.

Congratulations to Jeff Daniels, the theatre's staff, and countless others responsible for the Purple Rose's tremendous success and growth these past 25 years—and best wishes for many more years of continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO GARY BOOTH

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today, I wish to honor Gary Booth, a lifelong resident of Billings, Montana, and a decorated Vietnam veteran.

I ask that the remarks that I made in Montana at a ceremony honoring Gary Booth be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

Gary, on behalf of myself, my fellow Montanans, and my fellow Americans, I would like to extend our deepest gratitude for your service to this nation.

Gary was born on July 25, 1944, in St. Anthony, Idaho, to Francis and Fern Booth. He was welcomed by his older brother Edwin, and joined by his younger brother William shortly thereafter. His father Francis bought, sold, and transported produce all across the west—an occupation that brought the family to Billings in 1948.

So Billings became the town that Gary grew up in, attending the Lockwood School from grades 1–9, before graduating from Billings Senior High in 1962.

After high school, he tried his hand at fanning and auto repair, before going back into the family trucking businesses. But he wasn't settled long before he got the call; it was September 30th of 1965 and he was being called for duty.

Gary answered the call, but stuck to his principles, enlisting as a conscientious objector. This meant he would protect and serve, while forgoing the aid of a firearm. So he was shipped off to Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, Texas, where he went through basic training, as well as an additional 10 weeks of advance medic training. After that, he joined the Fourth Infantry Division at Fort Louis, in Tacoma, Washington, where he continued to train until his comrades shipped out from Seattle in June of 1966.

He and the rest of the Fourth Infantry Division reached the eastern coast of Vietnam about a month later, in late July, arriving at the Port of Qui Nhon (QUINN-YAWN). From there they trekked more than a hundred miles to the west-coast city of Pleiku (PLAY-COO), which would serve as their base of operations as they patrolled the dense jungle spanning the border between Cambodia and Vietnam.

This was in November, and for the next few months Gary and his fellow soldiers cycled through weeks of search and destroy missions in the jungles of Pleiku, punctuated by brief stints back at the larger artillery base, where they kept watch and took whatever opportunity they could to "rest."

It was towards the end of the day, during one of these search and destroy missions, when the sun was about to set, that Gary and his comrades came across an open clearing in the jungle where they decided to set up camp for the night.

It was now February, months had passed since their arrival, and they had fallen into a routine. Part of the company would stay back and set up camp for the night, while a

few soldiers—known as "OP's"—took up observation posts, and two patrol squads headed out to secure a 100-yard perimeter around the clearance.

Before the soldiers disbursed, Gary gave everyone a prodigious reminder. "If anyone needs me," he yelled, "holler 'Doc,' instead of 'Medic.'" This was because the North Vietnamese had figured out what "medic" meant, making the soldier who responded to that call instant high-value targets.

With that, the soldiers set off. But just minutes later, a familiar sound rang out. It was the click of a gun being chambered, the only warning the patrol squad received before being ambushed by a battalion four times their size.

The basecamp was soon under fire and as the machine gunners took up arms, the other soldiers sought cover behind a sparse line of trees. About 10 minutes into the firefight one of the machine gunners called for help; his weapon had been hit by enemy fire, dislocating the barrel of his gun and propelling shrapnel into his right shoulder.

Under heavy fire, Gary ran to the his fellow soldier's aid, bandaging his wounds as the gunner used his bare hand to hold the barrel of his broken gun in place and return enemy fire. After Gary had finished bandaging the gunner's shoulder, he tied another bandage around the gun to help steady the barrel and protect the gunner's hand from the intense heat.

Once Gary made his way back to the trees, another soldier began calling for help. This time it was an OP who had been shot in the lower back as he was returning from his observation post. Gary yelled at the man—who had stopped about 50 yards away from him—to take cover behind his tree, but the soldier was too injured to move.

So with bullets raining down and mortar bombs going off around him, Gary directed the nearest machine gunners to give him cover as he ran head first into the line of fire to retrieve his fallen comrade. Gary slung the injured man over his back and ran for cover. Once the pair was back behind the trees, Gary went to work bandaging the man's wounds and, once he got the bleeding to stop, called for help to get the man back to basecamp.

About 10 minutes later, Gary was called upon again. The machine gunner with the broken barrel had now taken a bullet to the foot. So Gary ran over and was tending to the wound when, all of a sudden, he felt a sharp pain pierce his left leg. He had taken a bullet directly to the femur. His leg was broken so, finding himself immobilized, Gary called for his fellow soldiers to get help.

There were a total of five medics dispersed among the platoon, so his comrades pulled him off to the perimeter of the basecamp while he waited for a fellow medic to arrive. The canopy was so dense that air support couldn't reach the camp by helicopter, so the medic put a splint around Gary's leg and covered him with a poncho. All he could do now was wait out the fight. When the fighting finally subsided the next morning, Gary's poncho was covered in shrapnel and debris, but he was still alive.

The U.S. had prevailed, but only after eight soldiers had died and 39 more were wounded. Even more would die if the wounded weren't evacuated quickly, so the soldiers went to work clearing space for air support to land. Every soldier carried with him a small amount of C-4, usually in the band of their sock. Each individual's piece was then collected and combined to make an explosive large enough to blow a hole through the jungle's thick canopy.

Finally, after surviving hours under siege—without ever setting hands on a firearm—Gary was air lifted out of the battle

zone to the nearest base. From there he was shipped off to the Philippines, where he was confined to a body cast for about a week before being transferred to an army hospital in Japan. Gary spent the next three months recovering in Japan, with the help of his younger brother who, in a twist of fate, had been stationed as a medic at the very same place.

Eventually, Gary returned to Fort Louis in Tacoma, Washington, where he spent almost a year learning how to walk again. Once he recovered, Gary was medically discharged from the army with 60% disability. He returned to Billings, went into business with his father, and spent the next 43 years in the trucking industry.

Gary has been married to his wife Ellen, a fellow Billings native, for 42 years and together they raised their son Christopher, who Gary adopted when he was just three years old. Christopher and his wife Gale now have two sons of their own, making Gary a proud grandfather to Christopher Murphree—who served in Afghanistan as a member of the National Guard—and Donovan Arnold, a boy scout whose troop conducted a beautiful flag ceremony here today.

The family all still lives in Billings, where Gary volunteers at his local VFW post—Mark Curtis #6774. He and a group of fellow veterans perform flag ceremonies and 21 Gun Salutes at military funerals throughout the county. Gary has performed at nearly two dozen military funerals since joining the group in January.

I now have the profound honor of presenting Gary with his own set of military honors. For his courage and valor in battle, Gary Booth received the:

Purple Heart
Bronze Star Medal
Good Conduct Medal
Combat Medic Badge 1st award
Republic of Vietnam Campaign Ribbon w/Service
Vietnamese Service Medal with 1 bronze service star
National Defense Service Medal

Gary, these medals serve as a small token of our country's appreciation for your incredible service and profound sacrifice.

You are a true American hero. Thank you so much for your service.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:27 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, without amendment:

S. 2840. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to

authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds for active shooter training, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3394. An act to amend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 to allow for the use of certain assets of foreign persons and entities to satisfy certain judgments against terrorist parties, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4768. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the nature of judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions.

H.R. 5421. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to apply the exemption from State regulation of securities offerings to securities listed on a national security exchange that has listing standards that have been approved by the Commission.

H.R. 5658. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to codify the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program, 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. 142. Concurrent resolution supporting the bid of Los Angeles, California, to bring the 2024 Summer Olympic Games back to the United States and pledging the cooperation of Congress with respect to that bid.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4639. An act to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide modifications to authorities relating to the Office of Special Counsel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4768. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the nature of judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5421. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to apply the exemption from State regulation of securities offerings to securities listed on a national security exchange that has listing standards that have been approved by the Commission; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5658. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to codify the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 10. An act to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4465. An act to decrease the deficit by consolidating and selling Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4487. An act to reduce costs of Federal real estate, improve building security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4901. An act to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship:

Report to accompany S. 2850, A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-301).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 1656. A bill to provide for additional resources for the Secret Service, and to improve protections for restricted areas (Rept. No. 114-302).

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. ALEXANDER, Mr. BURR, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 3173. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a 90-day EHR reporting period for the determination of whether an eligible professional or eligible hospital is a meaningful EHR user and to remove the all-or-nothing approach to meaningful use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3174. A bill to establish an Interagency Council on Workforce Attachment to promote effective and coordinated workforce attachment strategies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a refundable first-time homebuyer tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 3176. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance efforts to address antibiotic resistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 3177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax-exempt financing of certain government-owned buildings; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3178. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit hospitals in all-urban States to be considered Medicare dependent hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 3179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and extend the credit for carbon dioxide sequestration; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 3180. A bill to improve hiring and human resources flexibilities for Federal agencies in geographic areas affected by unique situations or circumstances, including remoteness, that cause recruitment and retention challenges, and to provide agencies experiencing such challenges with a toolkit of resources to overcome those challenges; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 3181. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 3182. A bill to provide further means of accountability of the United States debt and promote fiscal responsibility; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3183. A bill to prohibit the circumvention of control measures used by Internet ticket sellers to ensure equitable consumer access to tickets for any given event, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3184. A bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3185. A bill to provide that section 4108(5)(C)(iv) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 may be known as "Bree's Law"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 3186. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for active shooter and mass casualty incident response assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3187. A bill to increase the authorization of the National Transportation Safety Board through fiscal year 2020, to require the NTSB to investigate major oil and other hazardous materials derailments, to expand the Secretary of Transportation's emergency order authority, and to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a volatility standard for crude oil transported by rail; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3188. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the incentives for biodiesel; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 3189. A bill to improve access to health care in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 3190. A bill to enhance the rural health workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 3191. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the quality of health care furnished in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 3192. A bill to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as "Alex

Diekmann Peak"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 3193. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award competitive grants to enhance collaboration between State child welfare and juvenile justice systems; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 3194. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote healthy eating and physical activity among children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 3195. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve Medicare beneficiary access to ventilators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 3196. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to transition the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to a 5-member board of directors; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3197. A bill to reestablish the Office of Noise Abatement and Control in the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 3198. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 3199. A bill to require the appropriation of funds to use a fee, fine, penalty, or proceeds from a settlement received by a Federal agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 3200. A bill to prohibit mandatory or compulsory check-off programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3201. A bill to prohibit certain practices relating to certain commodity promotion programs, to require greater transparency by those programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3202. A bill to facilitate the transport of additional hydrocarbons to extend the life of the trans-Alaska oil pipeline, to further American energy security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3203. A bill to provide for economic development and access to resources in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3204. A bill to provide for the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the

State of Alaska for the construction of a road between King Cove and Cold Bay; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 3205. A bill to allow local Federal officials to determine the manner in which non-motorized uses may be permitted in wilderness areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 3206. A bill to promote worldwide access to the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 3207. A bill to authorize the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped to provide playback equipment in all formats; considered and passed.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit fully refundable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. KING):

S. 3209. A bill to require the use of prescription drug monitoring programs and to facilitate information sharing among States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 530. A resolution supporting the termination of the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives established pursuant to House Resolution 461, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. Res. 531. A resolution celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship Program and recognizing the significant contributions of Albert Einstein Fellows; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 532. A resolution celebrating the 140th anniversary of the State of Colorado; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Res. 533. A resolution designating July 26, 2016, as "United States Intelligence Professionals Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 534. A resolution relative to the death of William L. Armstrong, former

United States Senator for the State of Colorado; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ENZI, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. Con. Res. 47. A concurrent resolution expressing support for fostering closer economic and commercial ties between the United States and the United Kingdom following the decision of the people of the United Kingdom to withdraw from the European Union; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 366

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 429

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic foster care services in Medicaid.

S. 497

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 613

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 774, a bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medi-

care program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 1072

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1072, a bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics.

S. 1088

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1088, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for voter registration through the Internet, and for other purposes.

S. 1139

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1139, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration.

S. 1176

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1176, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes.

S. 1400

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1400, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the task force of the Office of Veterans Business Development to provide access to and manage the distribution of excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses.

S. 1520

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1520, a bill to protect victims of stalking from violence.

S. 1536

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1536, a bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent,

nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program.

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1833, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.

S. 2031

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2031, a bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

S. 2034

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2034, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim.

S. 2042

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2042, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to strengthen protections for employees wishing to advocate for improved wages, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment and to provide for stronger remedies for interference with these rights, and for other purposes.

S. 2108

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2108, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of certain long-term care hospital payment rules and the moratorium on the establishment of certain hospitals and facilities.

S. 2272

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2272, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding proprietary institutions of higher education in order to protect students and taxpayers.

S. 2352

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2352, a bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to require mandatory reporting of incidents of child abuse or neglect, and for other purposes.

S. 2424

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2424, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

S. 2483

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2483, a bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one Congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment, to require States to conduct such redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes.

S. 2484

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2484, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XI of the Social Security Act to promote cost savings and quality care under the Medicare program through the use of telehealth and remote patient monitoring services, and for other purposes.

S. 2531

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2531, a bill to authorize State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2590

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2590, a bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and the delivery of, children's health services through school-based health centers, and for other purposes.

S. 2595

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 2595, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 2599

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to prohibit unfair and deceptive advertising of hotel room rates, and for other purposes.

S. 2612

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2612, a bill to ensure United States jurisdiction over offenses committed by United States personnel stationed in Canada in furtherance of border security initiatives.

S. 2763

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2763, a bill to provide the

victims of Holocaust-era persecution and their heirs a fair opportunity to recover works of art confiscated or misappropriated by the Nazis.

S. 2785

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2785, a bill to protect Native children and promote public safety in Indian country.

S. 2823

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the section 45 credit for refined coal from steel industry fuel, and for other purposes.

S. 2895

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2895, a bill to extend the civil statute of limitations for victims of Federal sex offenses.

S. 2912

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2912, a bill to authorize the use of unapproved medical products by patients diagnosed with a terminal illness in accordance with State law, and for other purposes.

S. 2993

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2993, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the spill prevention, control, and countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms.

S. 3027

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3027, a bill to clarify the boundary of Acadia National Park, and for other purposes.

S. 3083

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3083, a bill to provide housing opportunities in the United States through modernization of various housing programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3127

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 3127, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance protections of Native Amer-

ican cultural objects, and for other purposes.

S. 3129

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3129, a bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2016.

S. 3132

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3132, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide service dogs to certain veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder.

S. 3134

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3134, a bill to improve Federal population surveys by requiring the collection of voluntary, self-disclosed information on sexual orientation and gender identity in certain surveys, and for other purposes.

S. 3140

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3140, a bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending.

S. 3155

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3155, a bill to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title.

S. 3159

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3159, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for energy storage technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 3160

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3160, a bill to require all Department of State employees to use Department-managed email accounts and telephonic systems for all work-related electronic communications, to require the Secretary of State to submit an annual report to Congress on any security violations within the Department, to provide training to Department of State employees on the rules and procedures governing the appropriate handling of classified information, to reform the process for identifying and archiving classified information, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S.J. RES. 16

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 16, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

S.J. RES. 35

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 35, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of Labor relating to "Interpretation of the 'Advice' Exemption in Section 203(c) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act".

S. CON. RES. 46

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 46, a concurrent resolution expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to continue to reaffirm its commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 508, a resolution expressing support for the expeditious consideration and finalization of a new, robust, and long-term Memorandum of Understanding on military assistance to Israel between the United States Government and the Government of Israel.

S. RES. 515

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 515, a resolution welcoming Prime Minister Lee Hsien-Loong to the United States and reaffirming Singapore's strategic partnership with the

United States, encompassing broad and robust economic, military-to-military, law enforcement, and counterterrorism cooperation.

S. RES. 521

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 521, a resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2016 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month.

S. RES. 526

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 526, a resolution calling for all parties to respect the arbitral tribunal ruling with regard to the South China Sea and to express United States policy on freedom of navigation and overflight in the East and South China Seas.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3184. A bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday I had the privilege of attending a memorial service for the brave Dallas police officers who lost their lives almost a week ago. It was a fitting tribute to these courageous men who fought evil and who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Through such a sad and tumultuous time, the brave leadership of Mayor Mike Rawlings and Police Chief Brown has been a constant source of inspiration.

A number of people have stopped me in the hallway and said: Have you seen or heard this police chief in Dallas?

I said: Absolutely.

Have you seen the sort of leadership and the calming influence Mayor Rawlings has provided in a time where people are confused, distraught, angry? It has been very impressive. They have gone above and beyond the call to bring as much comfort to the city as they possibly can. While they have shown the world what poise under pressure looks like, I want to say how proud I am of their dedication to the people of Dallas and their steady and unwavering hand.

The events of last week serve as a terrible reminder that our law enforcement officers face multiple threats in their line of duty every day and that some twisted, deranged individuals will stop at nothing to target them.

Mayor Rawlings was right yesterday when he said that the officers in Dallas did nothing wrong. He is absolutely right. They were just doing their job.

Here is what I would like to hear a little bit more about from our leaders here in Washington and around the

country: There is no justification—zero, zip, nada—no justification for violence against police officers. There is none. You can't justify what happened in Dallas with something that happened in Ferguson, in Baltimore, or some other place around the country.

Chief Brown said that what we need to do is not paint with a broad brush the 99 percent of police officers who do what they should be doing in a brave and heroic sort of way because of the actions of the 1 percent or whatever the rogue individual might be. What he said we need to do is to hold the officers who do misbehave, who don't respect the communities they are serving, and who cross the line—we need to hold them accountable, and he is exactly right.

What I hope we will hear more about, as the President talked about yesterday, is the importance of having this national discussion about race, about law enforcement. What I hope we hear more of is some clarity from our national leaders. Our police officers in Dallas were doing nothing more than keeping order and protecting civilians in peaceful protests.

The supreme irony in Dallas is that the people protesting were part of Black Lives Matter. Who was protecting them? The very police officers targeted by this deranged shooter.

Actually, as President Obama acknowledged yesterday, the Dallas Police Department is a national model for how to deescalate conflict in communities and work with communities to reduce crime. Again, it is another irony that this terrible tragedy occurred there against that department.

In the aftermath of this great national tragedy, we do need to come together as a country and have some uncomfortable discussions, perhaps. We need to get beyond the talking points in our comfort zone. But the one thing we need to do absolutely is to come together to show our support for those who get up every morning, put on their badge, and walk out the door not knowing if they will come home at the end of the day. We can do that by sending a clear message that America will not tolerate those who seek to kill those who are duty-bound to defend us. We will not stand for it. This should go without saying.

In the aftermath of the Dallas attack, we have another chance to stand up for law enforcement and stand united for policies that better support them.

Today I am introducing legislation with our colleague from North Carolina, Senator TILLIS, and our colleague from Texas, Senator CRUZ, called the Back the Blue Act, which would do just that.

Many folks have seen the hashtag "Back the Blue" on social media, online. It is a small way for Americans to show their solidarity with our law enforcement officials and their families following this tragedy, and that is where this legislation gets its name.

The Back the Blue Act would create a new Federal crime for killing or attempting to kill a Federal judge, a law enforcement officer, or someone funded by Federal funds—a federally funded public safety officer. Under this bill, an offender would be subject to a range of penalties, from a minimum of a 30-year mandatory minimum sentence for murder ranging up to the death penalty.

I think it is more important than ever for us to make this kind of clear and unequivocal statement about our support for law enforcement. This is the very glue that holds our country together, and without the safety and security they provide, none of our other freedoms are really possible.

The Back the Blue Act would also create a new crime for assaulting a law enforcement official and create a new law prohibiting the fleeing to avoid punishment for assaulting a law enforcement official. As I said, there is no excuse, no justification—none whatsoever—for attacking a law enforcement officer. Most of us learned that from our parents while growing up, but apparently some people didn't learn that lesson, and we ought to make clear to those who did not get the memo, who did not learn that lesson, that assaulting a law enforcement officer is absolutely beyond the pale.

We need to show that we value the lives of our law enforcement, and we need to make it absolutely clear that we will hold those who carry out crimes against them accountable. The Back the Blue Act would do that.

The Back the Blue Act would also expedite court proceedings for cases that involve the death of a public safety officer.

It would make sure criminals aren't rewarded for committing a crime by recovering money damages from injuries they sustained while committing a felony or violent crime.

It would help strengthen our communities by allowing grant funding to be put toward efforts to foster more trust between police and those around them. This is something I am particularly proud of that has been happening in Dallas under Mayor Rawlings and Chief Brown. They make it absolutely clear that the responsibility of the law enforcement official is not to sit in their police car and wait for something to happen, to wait for someone to call; they believe in community policing, making sure law enforcement mixes and intermingles with the very people they are supposed to protect. Frequently, those same people can be the eyes and the ears that provide essential information to law enforcement so they can prevent criminal acts from occurring in the first place.

The final thing I would mention that this legislation would do is it would allow law enforcement officers to carry firearms in Federal facilities.

These are not expansive proposals; they are tailored measures that would better serve the men and women who serve our communities every day.

If now is not the time to show our support for law enforcement, when is? With the attention of the Nation riveted on events like those that occurred in Dallas, I think it is critically important that we take advantage of this opportunity to make this statement of solidarity.

Yesterday President Obama stressed the need to translate our words and prayers into action. This legislation is responsive to what the President said. It is one thing to offer people our best wishes and our thoughts and prayers; it is another thing to actually do something about it. This legislation does that.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation. We can do more for our police officers and their families, and we can start with the Back the Blue Act.

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. 3184

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 "Back the Blue Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) KILLING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1123. Killing of law enforcement officers

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

"(1) the terms 'Federal law enforcement officer' and 'United States judge' have the meanings given those terms in section 115;

"(2) the term 'federally funded public safety officer' means a public safety officer or judicial officer for a public agency that—

"(A) receives Federal financial assistance; and

"(B) is an agency of an entity that is a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any territory or possession of the United States, an Indian tribe, or a unit of local government of that entity;

"(3) the term 'firefighter' includes an individual serving as an official recognized or designated member of a legally organized volunteer fire department and an officially recognized or designated public employee member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew;

"(4) the term 'judicial officer' means a judge or other officer or employee of a court, including prosecutors, court security, pretrial services officers, court reporters, and corrections, probation, and parole officers;

"(5) the term 'law enforcement officer' means an individual, with arrest powers, involved in crime or juvenile delinquency control or reduction or enforcement of the laws;

"(6) the term 'public agency' includes a court system, the National Guard of a State to the extent the personnel of that National Guard are not in Federal service, and the defense forces of a State authorized by section 109 of title 32; and

"(7) the term 'public safety officer' means an individual serving a public agency in an

official capacity, as a law enforcement officer, as a firefighter, as a chaplain, or as a member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew.

"(b) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person to—

"(1) kill, or attempt or conspire to kill—

"(A) a United States judge;

"(B) a Federal law enforcement officer; or

"(C) a federally funded public safety officer while that officer is engaged in official duties, or on account of the performance of official duties; or

"(2) kill a former United States judge, Federal law enforcement officer, or federally funded public safety officer on account of the past performance of official duties.

"(c) PENALTY.—Any person that violates subsection (b) shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not less than 10 years or for life, or, if death results, shall be sentenced to not less than 30 years and not more than life, or may be punished by death."

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"1123. Killing of law enforcement officers."

(b) ASSAULT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 120. Assaults of law enforcement officers

"(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'federally funded State or local law enforcement officer' means an individual involved in crime and juvenile delinquency control or reduction, or enforcement of the laws (including a police, corrections, probation, or parole officer) who works for a public agency (that receives Federal financial assistance) of a State of the United States or the District of Columbia.

"(b) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful to assault a federally funded State or local law enforcement officer while engaged in or on account of the performance of official duties, or assaults any person who formerly served as a federally funded State or local law enforcement officer on account of the performance of such person's official duties during such service, or because of the actual or perceived status of the person as a Federally funded state or local law enforcement officer.

"(c) PENALTY.—Any person that violations subsection (b) shall be subject to a fine under this title and—

"(1) if the assault resulted in bodily injury (as defined in section 1365), shall be imprisoned not less than 2 years and not more than 10 years;

"(2) if the assault resulted in substantial bodily injury (as defined in section 113), shall be imprisoned not less than 5 years and not more than 20 years;

"(3) if the assault resulted in serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365), shall be imprisoned for not less than 10 years;

"(4) if a deadly or dangerous weapon was used during and in relation to the assault, shall be imprisoned for not less than 20 years; and

"(5) shall be imprisoned for not more than 1 year in any other case.

"(d) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—No prosecution of any offense described in this section may be undertaken by the United States, except under the certification in writing of the Attorney General, or a designee, that—

"(A) the State does not have jurisdiction;

"(B) the State has requested that the Federal Government assume jurisdiction;

"(C) the verdict or sentence obtained pursuant to State charges left demonstratively

unvindicated the Federal interest in eradicating bias-motivated violence; or

“(D) a prosecution by the United States is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of Federal officers, or a Federal grand jury, to investigate possible violations of this section.

“(e) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) OFFENSES NOT RESULTING IN DEATH.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished for any offense under this section unless the indictment for such offense is found, or the information for such offense is instituted, not later than 7 years after the date on which the offense was committed.

“(2) OFFENSES RESULTING IN DEATH.—An indictment or information alleging that an offense under this section resulted in death may be found or instituted at any time without limitation.”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“120. Killing of law enforcement officers.”.

(c) FLIGHT TO AVOID PROSECUTION FOR KILLING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1075. Flight to avoid prosecution for killing law enforcement officials

“(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which the person flees or under section 1114 or 1123, for a crime consisting of the killing, an attempted killing, or a conspiracy to kill a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer (as those terms are defined in section 115), or a federally funded public safety officer (as that term is defined in section 1123).

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person that violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not less than 10 years, in addition to any other term of imprisonment for any other offense relating to the conduct described in subsection (a).”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1075. Flight to avoid prosecution for killing law enforcement officials.”.

SEC. 3. SPECIFIC AGGRAVATING FACTOR FOR FEDERAL DEATH PENALTY KILLING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.

(a) AGGRAVATING FACTORS FOR HOMICIDE.—Section 3592(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

“(17) KILLING OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER, PROSECUTOR, JUDGE, OR FIRST RESPONDER.—The defendant killed or attempted to kill a person who is authorized by law—

“(A) to engage in or supervise the prevention, detention, or investigation of any criminal violation of law;

“(B) to arrest, prosecute, or adjudicate an individual for any criminal violation of law; or

“(C) to be a firefighter or other first responder.”.

SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON FEDERAL HABEAS RELIEF FOR MURDERS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) JUSTICE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND THEIR FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2254 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j)(1) For an application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court for a crime that involved the killing of a public safety officer (as that term is defined in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b)) or judge, while the public safety officer or judge was engaged in the performance of official duties, or on account of the performance of official duties by or status as a public safety officer or judge of the public safety officer or judge—

“(A) the application shall be subject to the time limitations and other requirements under sections 2263, 2264, and 2266; and

“(B) the court shall not consider claims relating to sentencing that were adjudicated in a State court.

“(2) Sections 2251, 2262, and 2101 are the exclusive sources of authority for Federal courts to stay a sentence of death entered by a State court in a case described in paragraph (1).”.

(2) RULES.—Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts is amended by adding at the end the following: “Rule 60(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall not apply to a proceeding under these rules in a case that is described in section 2254(j) of title 28, United States Code.”.

(3) FINALITY OF DETERMINATION.—Section 2244(b)(3)(E) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking “the subject of a petition” and all that follows and inserting: “reheard in the court of appeals or reviewed by writ of certiorari.”.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This paragraph and the amendments made by this paragraph shall apply to any case pending on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) TIME LIMITS.—In a case pending on the date of enactment of this Act, if the amendments made by this paragraph impose a time limit for taking certain action, the period of which began before the date of enactment of this Act, the period of such time limit shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) EXCEPTION.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall not bar consideration under section 2266(b)(3)(B) of title 28, United States Code, of an amendment to an application for a writ of habeas corpus that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, if the amendment to the petition was adjudicated by the court prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON RECOVERY OF CERTAIN DAMAGES FOR INDIVIDUALS ENGAGED IN FELONIES OR CRIMES OF VIOLENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1983) is amended by—

(1) striking “except that in any action” and all that follows through “relief was unavailable.” and inserting the following: “except that—

“(1) in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in the judicial capacity of that officer, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable; and

“(2) in any action seeking redress for any deprivation that was incurred in the course of, or as a result of, or is related to, conduct by the injured party that, more likely than not, constituted a felony or a crime of violence (as that term is defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code) (including any deprivation in the course of arrest or apprehension for, or the investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of, such an offense), a court may not award damages other than for

necessary out-of-pocket expenditures and other monetary loss.”; and

(2) indenting the last sentence as an undesignated paragraph.

(b) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—Section 722(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988(b)) is amended by striking “except that in any action” and all that follows and inserting the following: “except that—

“(1) in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in the judicial capacity of that officer, such officer shall not be held liable for any costs, including attorneys fees, unless such action was clearly in excess of the jurisdiction of that officer; and

“(2) in any action seeking redress for any deprivation that was incurred in the course of, or as a result of, or is related to, conduct by the injured party that, more likely than not, constituted a felony or a crime of violence (as that term is defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code) (including any deprivation in the course of arrest or apprehension for, or the investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of, such an offense), the court may not allow such party to recover attorney's fees.”.

SEC. 6. SELF-DEFENSE RIGHTS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 203 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3053 the following:

“§ 3054. Authority of law enforcement officers to carry firearms

“Any sworn officer, agent, or employee of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof, who is authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of law, or to supervise or secure the safety of incarcerated inmates, may carry firearms if authorized by law to do so. Such authority to carry firearms, with respect to the lawful performance of the official duties of a sworn officer, agent, or employee of a State or a political subdivision thereof, shall include possession incident to depositing a firearm within a secure firearms storage area for use by all persons who are authorized to carry a firearm within any building or structure classified as a Federal facility or Federal court facility, as those terms are defined under section 930, and any grounds appurtenant to such a facility.”.

(b) CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS BY QUALIFIED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Section 926B(e)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “any magazine and” after “includes”.

(c) CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS BY QUALIFIED RETIRED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Section 926C(e)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “any magazine and” after “includes”.

(d) SCHOOL ZONES.—Section 922(q)(2)(B)(vi) title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or a qualified law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926B(c))” before the semicolon.

(e) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations allowing persons described in section 3054 of title 18, United States Code, to possess firearms in a manner described by that section. With respect to Federal justices, judges, bankruptcy judges, and magistrate judges, such regulations shall be prescribed after consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States.

(f) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 203 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3053 the following:

“3054. Authority of law enforcement officers to carry firearms.”.

SEC. 7. IMPROVING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES AND THE COMMUNITIES THEY SERVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021, the Attorney General using covered amounts shall, using such amounts as are necessary not to exceed \$20,000,000, award grants to State, local, or tribal law enforcement agencies and appropriate non-governmental organizations to—

(1) promote trust and ensure legitimacy among law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve through procedural reforms, transparency, and accountability;

(2) develop comprehensive and responsive policies on key topics relevant to the relationship between law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve;

(3) balance the embrace of technology and digital communications with local needs, privacy, assessments, and monitoring;

(4) encourage the implementation of policies that support community-based partnerships in the reduction of crime;

(5) emphasize the importance of high quality and effective training and education through partnerships with local and national training facilities; and

(6) endorse practices that support officer wellness and safety through the re-evaluation of officer shift hours, including data collection and analysis.

(b) COVERED AMOUNTS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered amounts” means—

(1) any unobligated balances made available under the heading “GENERAL ADMINISTRATION” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE” in an appropriations Act in a fiscal year;

(2) any amounts made available for an “Edward Byrne Memorial criminal justice innovation program” under the heading “STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE” under the heading “OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE” in an appropriations Act in a fiscal year; or

(3) any combination of amounts described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3188. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the incentives for biodiesel; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have long been a champion of domestic biofuel production, including ethanol, biodiesel and cellulosic fuels. Domestic biodiesel production supports tens of thousands of jobs. Replacing traditional diesel with biodiesel reduces emissions and creates cleaner air. Homegrown biodiesel improves our energy security by diversifying our transportation fuels and reducing our dependence on foreign oil. Biodiesel itself is a very diverse fuel. It can be produced from a wide array of resources such as recycled cooking oil, soybean and other plant oils, and animal fats.

I am proud of the success of the American biodiesel industry, and I am glad to be introducing today the Biodiesel Tax Incentive Reform and Ex-

ension Act of 2016, which will ensure the continued success. I appreciate Senator CANTWELL’s leadership in joining this effort. I also appreciate the support of Senators ROBERTS, HEITKAMP, THUNE, WHITEHOUSE, KIRK, HEINRICH, ERNST, DONNELLY, BLUNT, HIRONO, FRANKEN and MURRAY. This bill will modify the biodiesel fuel blenders credit to a domestic production credit, and extend the credit through 2019.

Congress created the biodiesel tax incentive in 2005 when I was Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. As a result of this incentive, and the Renewable Fuel Standard, biodiesel is providing significant benefits to the nation.

Senator CANTWELL and I have been advocating since 2009 to modify the current incentive. We have proposed making the credit available for the domestic production of biodiesel, rather than a mixture credit available to the blender of the fuel.

The bill we are introducing today is similar to an amendment that I offered with Senator CANTWELL during consideration of the tax extenders package in the Senate Finance Committee in July of last year. Our biodiesel reform amendment passed unanimously by voice vote.

Converting to a producer credit improves the incentive in many ways. The blenders credit can be difficult to administer, because the blending of the fuel can occur at many different stages of the fuel distribution. This can make it difficult to ensure that only fuel that qualifies for the credit claims the incentive. It has been susceptible to abuse because of this.

A credit for domestic production will also ensure that we are incentivizing the domestic industry, rather than subsidizing imported biofuels. It is projected that imports from Argentina, Indonesia, Singapore, the European Union, South Korea and others could exceed 1.8 billion gallons over 2016 and 2017.

We should not provide a U.S. taxpayer benefit to imported biofuels. By restricting the credit to domestic production, we’ll also save taxpayer money. The amendment adopted in the Finance Committee was estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation to reduce the cost of the extension by \$90 million.

Importantly, modifying the credit will have little to no impact on the consumer. Much of the credit will continue to be passed on to the blender and ultimately, the consumer. Additionally, the U.S. biodiesel industry is currently operating at approximately 55 percent of capacity. The domestic biodiesel industry has the capacity and access to affordable feedstocks to meet the demand of U.S. consumers.

The current biodiesel credit expires at the end of this year. It is my hope that when the Senate considers legislation to extend expiring tax provisions, that the Biodiesel Tax Incentive Re-

form and Extension Act of 2016, will be included. I strongly encourage the leadership of the House and Senate to include these biodiesel reform policies that were adopted in the Senate Finance Committee unanimously last year.

This modification will ensure that the credit is doing what Congress intended—incentivizing investment in domestic biodiesel production. Surely we can agree that we should not be providing a U.S. taxpayer subsidy to already heavily subsidized foreign biodiesel imports.

I therefore urge my colleagues to support the production of American biodiesel and this common-sense, cost reduction reform.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 3192. A bill to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as “Alex Diekmann Peak”; 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. 3192

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 “Alex Diekmann Peak Designation Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that Alex Diekmann—

(1) was a loving father of 2 and an adoring husband who lived in Bozeman, Montana, where he was a renowned conservationist who dedicated his career to protecting some of the most outstanding natural and scenic resource areas of the Northern Rockies;

(2) was responsible during his unique conservation career for the protection of more than 50 distinct areas in the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho, conserving for the public over 100,000 acres of iconic mountains and valleys, rivers and creeks, ranches and farms, and historic sites and open spaces;

(3) played a central role in securing the future of an array of special landscapes, including—

(A) the spectacular Devil’s Canyon in the Craig Thomas Special Management Area in the State of Wyoming;

(B) crucial fish and wildlife habitat and recreation access land in the Sawtooth Mountains of Idaho, along the Salmon River, and near the Canadian border; and

(C) diverse and vitally important land all across the Crown of the Continent in the State of Montana, from the world-famous Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem to Glacier National Park to the Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem, to the recreational trails, working forests and ranches, and critical drinking water supply for Whitefish, and beyond;

(4) made a particularly profound mark on the preservation of the natural wonders in and near the Madison Valley and the Madison Range, Montana, where more than 12 miles of the Madison River and much of the world-class scenery, fish and wildlife, and recreation opportunities of the area have become and shall remain conserved and available to the public because of his efforts;

(5) inspired others with his skill, passion, and spirit of partnership that brought together communities, landowners, sportsmen, and the public at large;

(6) lost a heroic battle with cancer on February 1, 2016, at the age of 52;

(7) is survived by his wife, Lisa, and their 2 sons, Logan and Liam; and

(8) leaves a lasting legacy across Montana and the Northern Rockies that will benefit all people of the United States in our time and in the generations to follow.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF ALEX DIEKMANN PEAK, MONTANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The unnamed 9,765-foot peak located 2.2 miles west-northwest of Finger Mountain on the western boundary of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness, Montana (UTM coordinates Zone 12, 457966 E., 4982589 N.), shall be known and designated as “Alex Diekmann Peak”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the peak described in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to “Alex Diekmann Peak”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 530—SUPPORTING THE TERMINATION OF THE SELECT INVESTIGATIVE PANEL OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ESTABLISHED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 461, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 530

Whereas Planned Parenthood provides high-quality, affordable health care for women, men, and young people, and is the nation's largest provider of sex education;

Whereas Planned Parenthood provides sexual and reproductive health care, education, information, and outreach to nearly 5,000,000 women, men, and adolescents worldwide in a single year;

Whereas officials in 13 States have concluded investigations into Planned Parenthood affiliates having found no wrongdoing on behalf of Planned Parenthood, and officials in additional eight States have declined to open investigations citing a lack of any evidence against Planned Parenthood to suggest wrongdoing;

Whereas the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives has found no wrongdoing on the part of Planned Parenthood;

Whereas the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives has recently authorized an additional \$490,000 in unnecessary spending, bringing the panel's total expenditures to \$790,000 thus far;

Whereas the Zika virus is a looming public health emergency across the United States that has been linked to severe birth defects, including microcephaly, in children of women infected during pregnancy;

Whereas the Zika virus is spreading rapidly across the Americas, with the Puerto Rican Department of Health reporting a one-week jump of 40 percent in the number of pregnant women on the island who were diagnosed with Zika;

Whereas family planning services and sex education are the primary tools currently available to directly prevent the devastating outcomes of the Zika virus;

Whereas the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives has turned their focus to investigating scientific researchers engaged in public health research, such as the Zika virus, using fetal tissue; and

Whereas scientific researchers have reported the diminishing availability of fetal tissue for their critical research to try to develop a vaccine for the Zika virus, Alzheimer's, and other diseases impacting Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the immediate termination of the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives established pursuant to House Resolution 461, agreed to October 7, 2015; and

(2) supports rescinding any unspent funds and making those funds available to the Department of Health and Human Services for efforts to combat Zika for women and children.

SENATE RESOLUTION 531—CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALBERT EINSTEIN DISTINGUISHED EDUCATOR FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM AND RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS OF ALBERT EINSTEIN FELLOWS

Mr. TILLIS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 531

Whereas the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship Program was established in 1990 and formalized by law in 1994;

Whereas Einstein Fellows are selected through a highly competitive process from among the best science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teachers in the field and represent diverse geographic regions and communities;

Whereas the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship Program places exceptional teachers in positions within Federal agencies and on Capitol Hill where they contribute to advancing the fields of education, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and public policy;

Whereas the Department of Energy, through its Office of Workforce Development for Teachers & Scientists, and the Triangle Coalition for STEM Education have nurtured and developed the Einstein Fellowship Program;

Whereas over 270 Einstein Fellows have served professionally at the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administra-

tion (NOAA), the National Science Foundation (NSF), the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), the United States Senate, and the United States House of Representatives;

Whereas the Einstein Fellowship Program fosters a spirit of cooperation between Federal agencies by placing a network of fellows at different agencies;

Whereas Einstein Fellows provide practical perspectives on the application and impact of education policy;

Whereas Einstein Fellows have made invaluable contributions to the formulation of educational policy through advice to Members of Congress and officials in Federal agencies, the development of legislation, and the creation of innovative educational programs and interventions;

Whereas Einstein Fellows have experienced unique opportunities for professional growth and development that allow for the expansion of skills and knowledge;

Whereas Einstein Fellows learn valuable leadership skills to advance the fields of education, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and public policy; and

Whereas Einstein Fellows, during their service and upon the continuation of their professional careers, serve as role models and examples of dedication and commitment for past, present, and future generations of educators and public servants: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of the 25th anniversary of the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship Program;

(2) recognizes the value of having current science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teachers directly engaged in the policymaking process;

(3) recognizes the sacrifices made by teachers who interrupt their careers to serve as Einstein Fellows;

(4) supports the continuation of the Einstein Fellowship program;

(5) encourages Federal agencies and congressional offices to host Einstein Fellows and to leverage the expertise of former Einstein Fellows; and

(6) recognizes the contributions of past, present, and future Einstein Fellows.

SENATE RESOLUTION 532—CELEBRATING THE 140TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 532

Whereas Colorado joined the Union as the 38th State on August 1, 1876, when President Ulysses S. Grant signed a statehood proclamation;

Whereas statehood was granted to Colorado after Colorado became a territory in 1861 and Jerome Chaffee, a Representative for the territory, convinced Congress that the population had increased enough for statehood to be approved;

Whereas the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado, educates and trains brave men and women in the Air Force;

Whereas Colorado has 6 military bases that are home to the honorable men and women who serve the United States;

Whereas there are more than 36,000 farms in Colorado, located on more than 31,000,000 acres, which grow a variety of crops, including barley, grapes, sunflowers, and beans;

Whereas Colorado ranks fifth in the United States for potato production and produces 2,000,000,000 pounds of potatoes;

Whereas Colorado produces 8,000,000 bushels of barley each year and ranks third in the United States in breweries per capita with a total of 285 breweries;

Whereas Golden, Colorado, is home to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (commonly referred to as "NREL"), which is transforming the ways the people of the United States use and develop energy through research;

Whereas Colorado is ranked twelfth in the United States for installed solar energy capacity and eighth in the United States for the number of wind turbines located within the State;

Whereas, with an average of more than 300 days of sunshine per year, Colorado is one of the sunniest States in the United States;

Whereas Colorado is home to the Southern Ute Tribe and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe;

Whereas Colorado is home to 58 mountain peaks rising 14,000 feet above sea level;

Whereas Colorado has world renowned skiing and snowboarding, with 25 resorts for Coloradans and out-of-State visitors to enjoy;

Whereas Colorado has 4 National Parks, including the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park, the Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve, Mesa Verde National Park, and Rocky Mountain National Park;

Whereas Colorado is also home to numerous monuments, wilderness areas, recreation areas, and historic trails, all of which ensure that beautiful landscapes are preserved and provide recreation opportunities for all;

Whereas Colorado is a national leader in aerospace, where companies develop cutting edge technology to propel the United States into the future; and

Whereas Colorado is a symbol of the beauty and opportunity America has to offer, and Katherine Lee Bates wrote the poem "America the Beautiful" after being inspired during a hike up Pikes Peak: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends and celebrates Colorado and the people of Colorado on the 140th anniversary of the State of Colorado.

SENATE RESOLUTION 533—DESIGNATING JULY 26, 2016, AS "UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS DAY"

Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 533

Whereas on July 26, 1908, Attorney General Charles Bonaparte ordered newly-hired Federal investigators to report to the Office of the Chief Examiner of the Department of Justice, which subsequently was renamed the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

Whereas on July 26, 1947, President Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), creating the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, thereby laying the foundation for today's intelligence community;

Whereas the National Security Act of 1947, which appears in title 50 of the United States Code, governs the definition, composition,

responsibilities, authorities, and oversight of the intelligence community of the United States;

Whereas the intelligence community is defined by section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) to include the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, other offices within the Department of Defense for the collection of specialized national intelligence through reconnaissance programs, the intelligence elements of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Department of Energy, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of the Treasury, the elements of the Department of Homeland Security concerned with the analysis of intelligence information, and other elements as may be designated;

Whereas July 26, 2016, is the 69th anniversary of the signing of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.);

Whereas the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458; 118 Stat. 3638) created the position of the Director of National Intelligence to serve as the head of the intelligence community and to ensure that national intelligence be timely, objective, independent of political considerations, and based upon all sources available;

Whereas Congress has previously passed joint resolutions, signed by the President, to designate Peace Officers Memorial Day on May 15, Patriot Day on September 11, and other commemorative occasions, to honor the sacrifices of law enforcement officers and of those who lost their lives on September 11, 2001;

Whereas the United States has increasingly relied upon the men and women of the intelligence community to protect and defend the security of the United States in the years since the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas the men and women of the intelligence community, both civilian and military, have been increasingly called upon to deploy to theaters of war in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere since September 11, 2001;

Whereas numerous intelligence officers of the elements of the intelligence community have been injured or killed in the line of duty;

Whereas intelligence officers of the United States are routinely called upon to accept personal hardship and sacrifice in the furtherance of their mission to protect the United States, to undertake dangerous assignments in the defense of the interests of the United States, to collect reliable information within prescribed legal authorities upon which the leaders of the United States rely in life-and-death situations, and to "speak truth to power" by providing their best assessments to decision makers, regardless of political and policy considerations;

Whereas the men and women of the intelligence community have on numerous occasions succeeded in preventing attacks upon the United States and allies of the United States, saving numerous innocent lives; and

Whereas intelligence officers of the United States must of necessity often remain unknown and unrecognized for their substantial achievements and successes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 26, 2016, as "United States Intelligence Professionals Day";

(2) acknowledges the courage, fidelity, sacrifice, and professionalism of the men and women of the intelligence community of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 534—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 534

Whereas William L. Armstrong (in this preamble referred to as "Bill Armstrong") was born in Fremont, Nebraska, and attended Tulane University and the University of Minnesota;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was a broadcaster and owner of media outlets, such as radio stations and newspapers;

Whereas Bill Armstrong served in the Army National Guard of the United States from 1957 to 1963, which brought him to Colorado;

Whereas at age 25 Bill Armstrong was elected to the Colorado House of Representatives, where he served from 1963 to 1964;

Whereas Bill Armstrong then served in the Colorado Senate from 1965 to 1972, where he became Majority Leader after only 4 years of service;

Whereas Bill Armstrong served the people of Colorado in the United States House of Representatives from 1973 to 1979 and in the United States Senate from 1979 to 1991;

Whereas Bill Armstrong served honorably as the Chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee from 1985 to 1991;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was a strong conservative who consistently advocated for such matters as fiscal discipline and tax reform, pay and benefits for military service members, and the support of small businesses;

Whereas Bill Armstrong worked to pass the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-34, 95 Stat. 172) and was recognized multiple times with the "Taxpayers' Friend" award by the National Taxpayers Union;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was named the "military pay champion" of the Senate by the *Army Times*;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was an ardent champion of small business;

Whereas Bill Armstrong earned the "Guardian of Small Business" award from the National Federation of Independent Business, and the Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry Public Service Award in 1982 for his distinguished service to the people of Colorado;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was instrumental to the passage of title I of Public Law 96-560 (94 Stat. 3265) (commonly known as the "Colorado National Forest Wilderness Act of 1980"), which preserved 1,400,000 acres of land;

Whereas Bill Armstrong continued to serve the people of Colorado for the last 10 years as president of Colorado Christian University;

Whereas Bill Armstrong possessed a strong faith and lived his life accordingly;

Whereas Bill Armstrong led hundreds of prayer breakfasts and served on the board of Campus Crusade for Christ and Christian Businessmen's Committee USA;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was a person of firm principle, worked towards meaningful

solutions, and described himself as “relatively inflexible on principles, but flexible on the details”;

Whereas, throughout his life, Bill Armstrong demonstrated great integrity and remarkable leadership; and

Whereas Bill Armstrong touched the lives of all those he served and helped families across Colorado through his devotion to public service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable William L. Armstrong, former member of the United States Senate;

(2) the Senate instructs the Secretary of the Senate to communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of William L. Armstrong; and

(3) when the Senate adjourns on the date of adoption of this resolution, it stands adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable William L. Armstrong.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 47—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR FOSTERING CLOSER ECONOMIC AND COMMERCIAL TIES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM FOLLOWING THE DECISION OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM TO WITHDRAW FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ENZI, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. CON. RES. 47

Whereas the United States and the United Kingdom are allies with a long tradition of working in close cooperation to support one another’s mutual interests;

Whereas the United Kingdom is the world’s fifth largest economy and one of the most important trading and economic partners of the United States;

Whereas expanding United States trade with the United Kingdom has the potential to benefit American businesses, farmers, ranchers, workers, and consumers;

Whereas a strong and economically vibrant United Kingdom capable of supporting global economic growth and promoting shared Anglo-American economic principles is in the national interest of the United States;

Whereas the voluntary exchange of goods and services among citizens of nations helps provide global economic stability, especially in times of economic uncertainty;

Whereas the United States also continues to support the member states of the European Union and seeks the further enhancement of economic and commercial ties between the United States and the European Union, including through the conclusion of a high-standard Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership; and

Whereas orderly and cooperative negotiations between the United Kingdom and the European Union that uphold the fundamental bases for trade and investment between the United Kingdom and the European Union are in the mutual interest of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the member states of the European Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) calls upon the President to consult with the Senate and the House of Representatives to consider opportunities to promote further economic and commercial activity and cooperation between the United States and the United Kingdom, including by way of a trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom;

(2) calls upon the President to invite the United Kingdom to begin discussions towards establishing the basis for negotiations for a trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom;

(3) recalls that section 103(d) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4202(d)) directs the President to commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers to United States trade where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States;

(4) recalls further that section 102 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4201) sets forth the negotiating objectives of the United States, and that the Senate and the House of Representatives expect that these congressionally-mandated negotiating objectives will be achieved in any United States trade agreement;

(5) urges the President, throughout discussions with the United Kingdom and in close consultation with the Senate and the House of Representatives, to determine whether negotiation of a trade agreement with the United Kingdom would be likely to achieve the negotiating objectives established by the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 and, if such negotiation would be likely to achieve such objectives, to commence negotiations towards a trade agreement with the United Kingdom as soon as appropriate;

(6) expresses support for enhanced economic and commercial ties between the United States and the European Union, including through the conclusion of a high-standard Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership;

(7) notes that the continued movement of goods, services, and capital between the United Kingdom and the European Union is important to American businesses invested in Europe and the United States economy generally; and

(8) calls upon the European Union and the United Kingdom to work constructively to achieve a climate for trade and investment that is mutually beneficial and productive.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about a resolution that I am submitting today regarding the importance of the trade and investment relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom. I also would like to discuss our Nation’s international trade policy more broadly, including our interest in negotiating and entering into trade agreements that satisfy the high standards that the Congress outlined in the Trade Promotion Authority, or TPA, statute we enacted last year.

Last month, the U.K. voted to withdraw from the European Union. The formal withdrawal process is at its beginning stages, and the U.K. and the EU have many issues to resolve as they work out their future political and economic relationship. I am optimistic that these issues will be resolved con-

structively, and that the U.K. and the EU will achieve a trade and investment climate that is mutually beneficial and productive and that supports the continuation of the United States’ close diplomatic, economic, and commercial ties with both the U.K. and the EU.

Throughout this process, the U.S. must continue to show strong support for the important and longstanding relationship that our country enjoys with the U.K. That relationship is rooted in democratic principles, a similar culture and a common language, a strong commitment to peace and security, and close and open economic and commercial ties. The U.S. and the U.K. have a long tradition of working together to support one another’s mutual interests, and the U.K.’s decision to withdraw from the EU should not jeopardize that tradition. In fact, the special relationship between our two countries must be fortified as the U.K. navigates the process of withdrawing from the EU.

It is in that spirit that I propose this resolution, which highlights the importance of the political, economic, and commercial relationship between the U.S. and the U.K., and calls upon the administration to consult with the Congress to examine ways to promote further economic and commercial activity and cooperation between our two countries, including through the negotiation of a high-standard trade agreement at the appropriate time.

The U.K. is the world’s fifth largest economy and one of the United States’ most important economic partners. Expanding U.S. trade with the U.K. would result in major benefits to both American and British businesses, workers, producers, and consumers. Furthermore, a strengthened economic partnership between the U.S. and the U.K. would produce important geopolitical benefits that are in our national interest.

As such, the resolution calls upon the President to consult with the Congress regarding opportunities to further economic and commercial activity and cooperation between the U.S. and the U.K., including considering a trade agreement between our two countries. However—and let me emphasize this point—as with any trade agreement negotiated by this administration or the next, any future trade agreement between the U.S. and the U.K. must adhere to the high standards outlined in the recently enacted TPA law, which established very specific objectives regarding the negotiation of trade agreements. Any future trade agreement with the U.K. needs to satisfy those objectives in order to qualify for TPA procedures.

Now that I have spoken about the importance of the trade and investment relationship between the U.S. and the U.K., I would like to speak about the importance of the trade and investment relationship between the United States and the European Union. While this resolution proposes stronger economic and commercial ties with the

U.K., it does the same for the EU. To be clear, the U.K.'s decision to withdraw from the EU should not jeopardize or weaken our country's relationship with the U.K., nor should it jeopardize or weaken our country's relationship with the EU. Both the U.K. and the EU are important diplomatic and economic partners of the United States.

As such, the resolution proposes stronger economic and commercial ties between the U.S. and the EU, including through the conclusion of a high-standard Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, T-TIP, agreement. Coincidentally, our trade negotiators are in Europe this week for the 14th round of T-TIP negotiations.

I would like to take a few moments to discuss Congress's expectations for T-TIP and to highlight areas of particular concern.

T-TIP presents an excellent opportunity for both the U.S. and the EU—the world's two largest economies—to strengthen our already robust economic relationship. That relationship is one of the most extensive and complex in the world. Together, our economies account for approximately half of world GDP and nearly one third of worldwide trade. Annual U.S.-EU trade amounts to hundreds of billions of dollars, and our two markets already are deeply integrated and relatively open. Nonetheless, opportunities exist for the U.S. and the EU to expand trade and investment by further reducing barriers and modernizing the rules that govern such trade and investment. But in order for T-TIP or any similar trade agreement to reach its full potential, it must reflect an unprecedented level of commitment—by both the EU and the Obama administration.

T-TIP also presents an excellent opportunity for the U.S. and the EU to work together to help set high standards for the world. If the agreement does not meet a high standard, then the rest of the world will take notice. In order to qualify as a high-standard agreement, T-TIP—just like any potential trade agreement between the U.S. and the U.K.—must satisfy the standards outlined in the TPA statute. If the agreement does not satisfy those standards, then it will face enormous difficulty in the Congress.

To do this, T-TIP must address several difficult areas. I will highlight only a few such areas and issues today, while noting that many others exist.

First, the agreement must have provisions that provide strong market access for agricultural products, including through the elimination of discriminatory geographical indication practices and unjustified sanitary and phytosanitary standards.

Second, the agreement must be comprehensive and not exclude any products or economic sectors from the negotiations. Of particular concern are services. The agreement should not broadly exempt future services or specifically exempt other types of services, including audiovisual services or

financial services. In particular, both the market access and the regulatory scope of the agreement should address financial services.

Third, a valid and passable T-TIP agreement must reflect the highest standards of protection for intellectual property rights. Moreover, any outcome on intellectual property must not jeopardize our country's ability to achieve high levels of intellectual property protection in other markets or in other negotiations.

Finally, T-TIP must address barriers to digital trade, including discriminatory treatment of digital products and barriers that inhibit the free flow of digital data, such as forced data localization policies. In short, the agreement must ensure that all products, services, and technologies are given the chance to compete in the marketplace.

T-TIP is intended to be a model for the world, so we must get it right.

The resolution that I'm introducing today notes the importance of economic cooperation among the U.S., the U.K., and the EU, and highlights the mutual benefits to be achieved through such cooperation. In particular, the resolution calls upon the EU and the U.K. to work constructively to achieve a climate for trade and investment that is mutually beneficial and productive; and it notes that the continued movement of goods, services, and capital between the U.K. and the EU is important not only to the U.K. and the EU, but also to American businesses invested in Europe and the U.S. economy generally. The U.S., the U.K., and the EU will all benefit as our countries work together to become economically stronger and more geopolitically secure.

Finally, I would like to say a few words regarding the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, agreement. I fought hard to secure TPA, in large part, so that this administration would have the ability to secure a strong TPP agreement. However, in a few important areas, TPP falls short. I am committed to working with the administration to help to improve on those shortcomings. In the meantime, it is essential that the administration begin to work with our TPP partners to develop meaningful country-specific implementation commitments.

During a hearing held by the Senate Finance Committee earlier this year, members of the Committee heard assessments from American exporters and stakeholders about the implementation of past free trade agreements. It is an unfortunate fact that the Obama administration has allowed free trade agreements to enter into force before ensuring that our partners have taken all steps necessary to comply with their obligations under the agreements. It is clear that more confidence regarding effective implementation of trade agreements will be necessary before the Congress approves TPP.

Moreover, as our TPP partners begin their domestic implementation proc-

esses, concerns are growing that the measures that our trading partners intend to take to implement TPP fall short of what is required by the agreement. Failure by our trading partners to fully and faithfully implement their TPP obligations threatens to reduce the value of the agreement for U.S. businesses, workers, farmers, ranchers, and consumers.

That is why it is essential that the Obama administration now work to reach country-specific plans identifying the changes that our trading partners must and will make to their laws, regulations, and practices in order to meet their key TPP obligations. These country-specific implementation commitments would provide a valuable tool for resolving shortcomings and ambiguities in the agreement, while helping to build confidence in the Congress that TPP will be implemented fully and faithfully by our trading partners. Put simply, these country-specific implementation commitments can be an essential component to developing the political support necessary for the Congress to pass TPP implementing legislation.

During the 114th Congress, we have successfully enacted a number of strong trade policies that reflect and advance our national interest. T-TIP and TPP negotiations represent important opportunities for the administration to use the tools provided by Congress to help American businesses, workers, and consumers to benefit from trade. We must remain vigilant to ensure that our trade objectives are met and hold the administration accountable for achieving the goals that the Congress has established. At the same time, we need to look toward the future.

The resolution that we are submitting today is designed to reinforce our support for strong, market-opening agreements and to remind this and future administrations that the Congress is, and will remain, an active participant in formulating U.S. trade policy.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4973. Mr. BLUNT proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2893, to reauthorize the sound recording and film preservation programs of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4973. Mr. BLUNT proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2893, to reauthorize the sound recording and film preservation programs of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 2, line 9, strike "\$750,000" and insert "\$1,000,000".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled "NASA at a Crossroads: Reasserting American Leadership in Space Exploration."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015: Ensuring Successful Implementation of Physician Payment Reforms."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 11:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 2:45 p.m., in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Campus Safety: Improving Prevention and Response Efforts."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 10 a.m., in Room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in Room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Researching the Potential Medical Benefits and Risks of Marijuana."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH CARE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health Care of the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Alzheimer's Disease: The Struggle for Families, a Looming Crisis for Medicare."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC, AND INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY POLICY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "U.S. Policy Options in the South China Sea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Zika in the Western Hemisphere: Risks and Response."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Warren Ponto, the committee's detailee from the FAA, be allowed privileges of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Alexandra Bratton, an intern on the Energy Committee, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sydney Jones, Macon Sheppard, William Aulgar, and Jemel Green-Harris, of my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of today's legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 2943

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the prayer and pledge on Thursday July 14, the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying S. 2943, and Senator MCCONNELL be recognized to make a compound motion to go to conference on S. 2943; further, that after cloture is filed on the compound motion, the time until 11:30 a.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees and that at 11:30 a.m. the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the compound motion to go to conference; further, that if cloture is invoked, the Senate agree to the compound motion to go to conference and there be two motions to instruct in order made by Senator SHAHEEN and Senator SULLIVAN; further, that Senator SHAHEEN be recognized to offer a motion to instruct the conferees and that there be up to 4 minutes of debate equally divided on the motion and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the Shaheen motion; that following the disposition of the Shaheen motion, Senator SULLIVAN be recognized to offer a motion to instruct the conferees and that there be up to 4 minutes of debate equally divided on the motion and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the Sullivan motion without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar Nos. 659 through 678 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Christian D. Becker

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (Ih) Bruce L. Gillingham

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Troy M. McClelland

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under article II, section 2, clause 2, of the United States Constitution:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Ronny L. Jackson

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Navy Reserve and appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5143:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Luke M. McCollum

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Steven M. Shepro

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Tammy S. Smith

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Brian E. Alvin

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Richard J. Heitkamp

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Miles A. Davis

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Fletcher V. Washington

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Nikki L. Griffin Olive

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Darius Banaji

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Tina A. Davidson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Gayle D. Shaffer

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Frank D. Whitworth

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Stephanie T. Keck

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. David A. Goggins

Capt. Douglas W. Small

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Richard D. Heinz

Capt. John T. Palmer

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Carl P. Chebi

Capt. Blake L. Converse

Capt. Charles B. Cooper, II

Capt. Paul T. Druggan

Capt. Donald D. Gabrielson

Capt. Alvin Holsey

Capt. Jeffrey T. Jablon

Capt. Gary A. Mayes

Capt. John F. Meier

Capt. James E. Pitts

Capt. Charles W. Rock

Capt. John B. Skillman

Capt. Murray J. Tynch, III

Capt. John F. Wade

Capt. Michael A. Wettlaufer

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S

DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1469 AIR FORCE nominations (6) beginning WALTER W. BEAN, and ending SCOTT L. RUMMAGE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2016.

PN1470 AIR FORCE nominations (53) beginning JENNIFER D. BANKSTON, and ending WILLIAM F. WOLFE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2016.

PN1579 AIR FORCE nominations (18) beginning RICHARD D. BETZOLD, and ending JENNIFER E. TONNESON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1580 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning STEFANIE L. SHAVER, and ending WILLIAM J. BRIDGHAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1613 AIR FORCE nomination of Erol Agi, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 2016.

IN THE ARMY

PN1321 ARMY nomination of Joshua D. Wright, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 7, 2016.

PN1339 ARMY nomination of Phillip W. Neal, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 14, 2016.

PN1581 ARMY nomination of Nathan D. Schroeder, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1582 ARMY nomination of Renee V. Scott, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1583 ARMY nomination of Keith D. Blodgett, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1584 ARMY nominations (10) beginning JEFFREY M. ALSTON, and ending MICHAEL J. TURLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1585 ARMY nomination of Steven C. Loos, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1586 ARMY nomination of Daniel W. M. Mackle, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1609 ARMY nomination of Michael P. Lindsay, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 2016.

PN1610 ARMY nomination of Brando S. Jobity, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 2016.

PN1611 ARMY nomination of David C. Martin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 2016.

IN THE NAVY

PN1612 NAVY nominations (5) beginning GREGORY A. VERLINDE, and ending DAVID T. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 2016.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SOUND RECORDING AND FILM PRESERVATION PROGRAMS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of S. 2893 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2893) to reauthorize the sound recording and film preservation programs of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate will pass the bipartisan Library of Congress Sound Recording and Film Preservation Programs Reauthorization Act of 2016, which authorizes two important cultural preservation programs through 2027. Senator GRASSLEY and I worked together on this legislation to help ensure that the films and

recordings that play vital roles in shaping and recording the American experience are preserved for future generations.

Advances in digital technology have opened up new avenues for creativity, allowing Americans to engage in artistic expression in innovative ways. As we embrace these new developments, we must also ensure that the records of our past are preserved. Films and sound recordings created by previous generations tell us who we are, and who we were, as a society; yet the passage of time has taken its toll on these historical works, erasing artifacts of our shared history and culture.

The legislation that will be passed today by the Senate continues Congress's long recognition of the importance of cultural preservation, reauthorizing both the National Film Preservation Program, which began in 1988, and the National Sound Recording Preservation Program, which began in 2000. These programs, operated within the Library of Congress, help preserve historical and cultural artifacts that would otherwise disappear or be destroyed through the passage of time. Through the preservation programs, the Library of Congress has created the National Film and National Recording Registries, to recognize the most essential artistic works our Nation has produced.

This legislation also reauthorizes the federally chartered National Film and National Recording Preservation Foundations. These foundations play a critical role in preservation efforts by providing grants to a wide array of educational and nonprofit organizations to preserve films and sound recordings. To date, the National Film Preservation Foundation has given grants to more than 270 organizations in all 50 States.

By reauthorizing these important programs, this legislation will allow the Library of Congress and the Foundations to continue their important work in preserving America's fading treasures, as well as providing grants that will help libraries, museums, and archives preserve these works and make them available for study and research. I look forward to prompt consideration of the bill by the House and to the President signing it into law.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Blunt amendment at the desk 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 amendment (No. 4973) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To increase the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated to the National Recording Preservation Foundation)

On page 2, line 9, strike "\$750,000" and insert "\$1,000,000".

The bill (S. 2893), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2893

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 "Library of Congress Sound Recording and Film Preservation Programs Reauthorization Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. SOUND RECORDING PRESERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) NATIONAL RECORDING PRESERVATION BOARD.—Section 133 of the National Recording Preservation Act of 2000 (2 U.S.C. 1743) is amended by striking "through fiscal year 2016" and inserting "through fiscal year 2026".

(b) NATIONAL RECORDING PRESERVATION FOUNDATION.—

(1) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 152411(a) of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking "through fiscal year 2016 an amount not to exceed" and inserting "through fiscal year 2026 an amount not to exceed the lesser of \$1,000,000 or".

(2) NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—Section 152403(b)(2) of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "nine directors" and inserting "12 directors"; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking "six directors" each place it appears and inserting "8 directors".

SEC. 3. FILM PRESERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) NATIONAL FILM PRESERVATION BOARD.—Section 112 of the National Film Preservation Act of 1996 (2 U.S.C. 179v) is amended by striking "through fiscal year 2016" and inserting "through fiscal year 2026".

(b) NATIONAL FILM PRESERVATION FOUNDATION.—Section 151711(a)(1)(C) of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking "through 2016" and inserting "through 2026".

AUTHORIZING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICE FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED TO PROVIDE PLAYBACK EQUIPMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3207, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3207) to authorize the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped to provide playback equipment in all formats.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3207) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3207

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICE FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED TO PROVIDE PLAYBACK EQUIPMENT IN ALL FORMATS.

The first sentence of the Act entitled "An Act to provide books for the adult blind", approved March 3, 1931 (2 U.S.C. 135a), is amended by striking "and for purchase, maintenance, and replacement of reproducers for such sound-reproduction recordings" and inserting "and for purchase, maintenance, and replacement of reproducers for any such forms".

FILIPINO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2015

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1555 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1555) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1555) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1555

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 "Filipino Veterans of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The First Philippine Republic was founded as a result of the Spanish-American War in which Filipino revolutionaries and the United States Armed Forces fought to overthrow Spanish colonial rule. On June 12, 1898, Filipinos declared the Philippines to be an independent and sovereign nation. The Treaty of Paris negotiated between the United States and Spain ignored this declaration of independence, and the United States paid Spain \$20,000,000 to cede control of the Philippines to the United States. Filipino nationalists who sought independence rather than a change in colonial rulers clashed with forces of the United States in the Islands. The Philippine-American War, which officially lasted for 3 years from 1899 to 1902, led to the establishment of the United States civil government in the Philippines.

(2) In 1901, units of Filipino soldiers who fought for the United States against the nationalist insurrection were formally incorporated into the United States Army as the Philippine Scouts.

(3) In 1934, the Philippine Independence Act (Public Law 73-127; 48 Stat. 456) established a timetable for ending colonial rule of the United States. Between 1934 and Philippine independence in 1946, the United States retained sovereignty over Philippine foreign policy and reserved the right to call Filipinos into the service of the United States Armed Forces.

(4) On December 21 1935, President of the Philippine Commonwealth, Manuel Quezon, signed the National Defense Act, passed by the Philippine Assembly. General Douglas MacArthur set upon the task of creating an independent army in the Philippines, consisting of a small regular force, the Philippine Constabulary, a police force created during the colonial period of the United States, and reservists. By July 1941, the Philippine army had 130,000 reservists and 6,000 officers.

(5) On July 26, 1941, as tensions with Japan rose in the Pacific, President Franklin D. Roosevelt used his authority vested in the Constitution of the United States and the Philippine Independence Act to "call into service of the United States . . . all of the organized military forces of the Government of the Philippines." On July 27th, 1941, in accordance with a War Department directive received a day earlier, the United States Forces in the Far East (USAFFE) was established, and Manila was designated as the command headquarters. Commander of the USAFFE, General Douglas MacArthur, planned to absorb the entire Philippine army into the USAFFE in phases. The first phase, which began on September 1, 1941, included 25,000 men and 4,000 officers.

(6) Filipinos who served in the USAFFE included—

(A) the Philippine Scouts, who comprised half of the 22,532 soldiers in the Philippine Department, or United States Army garrison stationed in the Islands at the start of the war;

(B) the Philippine Commonwealth Army;

(C) the new Philippine Scouts, or Filipinos who volunteered to serve with the United States Army when the United States Armed Forces returned to the island;

(D) Filipino civilians who volunteered to serve in the United States Armed Forces in 1945 and 1946, and who became "attached" to various units of the United States Army; and

(E) the "Guerrilla Services" who had fought behind enemy lines throughout the war.

(7) Even after hostilities ceased, wartime service of the new Philippine Scouts continued as a matter of law until the end of 1946, and the force gradually disbanded until it was disestablished in 1950.

(8) On December 8th, 1941, not even 24 hours after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Japanese Imperial forces attacked bases of the United States Army in the Philippines.

(9) In the spring of 1942, the Japanese 14th Army overran the Bataan Peninsula, and, after a heroic but futile defense, more than 78,000 members of the United States Armed Forces were captured, specifically 66,000 Filipinos and 12,000 service members from the United States. The Japanese transferred the captured soldiers from Bataan to Camp O'Donnell, in what is now known as the infamous Bataan Death March. Forced to march the 70-mile distance in 1 week, without adequate food, water, or medicine, nearly 700 members of the United States Armed Forces and an estimated 6,000 to 10,000 Filipinos perished during the journey.

(10) After the fall of the Bataan Peninsula, the Japanese Army turned its sights on Corregidor. The estimated forces in defense of Corregidor totaled 13,000, and were comprised of members of the United States Armed Forces and Filipino troops. Of this number,

800 were killed, 1,000 were wounded, and 11,000 were captured and forced to march through the city of Manila, after which the captured troops were distributed to various POW camps. The rest of the captured troops escaped to organize or join an underground guerrilla army.

(11) Even before the fall of Corregidor, Philippine resistance, in the form of guerrilla armies, began to wage warfare on the Japanese invaders. Guerrilla armies, from Northern Luzon to Mindanao—

(A) raided Japanese camps, stealing weapons and supplies;

(B) sabotaged and ambushed Japanese troops on the move; and

(C) with little weaponry, and severely out-matched in numbers, began to extract victories.

(12) Japanese intelligence reports reveal that from the time the Japanese invaded until the return of the United States Armed Forces in the summer of 1944, an estimated 300,000 Filipinos continued to fight against Japanese forces. Filipino resistance against the Japanese was so strong that, in 1942, the Imperial Army formed the Morista Butai, a unit designated to suppress guerrillas.

(13) Because Philippine guerrillas worked to restore communication with United States forces in the Pacific, General MacArthur was able to use the guerrillas in advance of a conventional operation and provided the headquarters of General MacArthur with valuable information. Guerrillas captured and transmitted to the headquarters of General MacArthur Japanese naval plans for the Central Pacific, including defense plans for the Mariana Islands. Intelligence derived from guerrillas relating to aircraft, ship, and troop movements allowed for Allied forces to attack Japanese supply lines and guerrillas and even directed United States submarines where to land agents and cargo on the Philippine coast.

(14) On December 20, 1941, President Roosevelt signed the Selective Training and Service Amendments Act (Public Law 77-360; 55 Stat. 844) which, among other things, allowed Filipinos in the United States to enlist in the United States Armed Forces. In February 1942, President Roosevelt issued the Second War Powers Act (Public Law 77-507; 56 Stat. 176), promising a simplified naturalization process for Filipinos who served in the United States Armed Forces. Subsequently, 16,000 Filipinos in California alone decided to enlist.

(15) The mobilization of forces included the activation and assumption of command of the First Filipino Infantry Battalion on April 1, 1942, at Camp San Luis Obispo, California. Orders were issued to activate the First Filipino Infantry Regiment and Band at Salinas, California, effective July 13, 1942. The activation of the Second Filipino Infantry Regiment occurred at Fort Ord, California, on November 21, 1942. Nearly 9,000 Filipinos and Filipino Americans fought in the United States Army 1st and 2nd Filipino Infantry Regiments.

(16) Soldiers of the 1st and 2nd Infantry Regiments participated in the bloody combat and mop-up operations at New Guinea, Leyte, Samar, Luzon, and the Southern Philippines. In 1943, 800 men were selected from the 1st and 2nd Regiments and shipped to Australia to receive training in intelligence gathering, sabotage, and demolition. Reorganized as part of the 1st Reconnaissance Battalion, this group was sent to the Philippines to coordinate with major guerrilla armies in the Islands. Members of the 1st Regiment were also attached to the United States 6th Army "Alamo Scouts", a reconnaissance group that traveled 30 miles behind enemy lines to free Allied prisoners from the Cabanatuan death camp on January 30, 1945. In

addition, in 1945, according to the 441st Counter Intelligence Unit of the United States Armed Forces, Philippine guerrillas provided "very important information and sketches of enemy positions and installations" for the liberation of the Santo Tomas prisoner of war camp, an event that made front page news across the United States.

(17) In March 1944, members of the 2nd Filipino Infantry Regiment were selected for special assignments, including intelligence missions, and reorganized as the 2nd Filipino Infantry Battalion (Separate). The 2nd Filipino Infantry Battalion (Separate) contributed to mop-up operations as a civil affairs unit.

(18) Filipinos participated in the war out of national pride, as well as out of a commitment to the Allied forces struggle against fascism. 57,000 Filipinos in uniform died in the war effort. Estimates of civilian deaths range from 700,000 to upwards of 1,000,000, or between 4.38 to 6.25 percent of the prewar population of 16,000,000.

(19) Because Filipinos who served in the Commonwealth Army of the Philippines were originally considered a part of the Allied struggle, the military order issued by President Roosevelt on July 26, 1941, stated that Filipinos who served in the Commonwealth Army of the Philippines were entitled to full veterans benefits. The guarantee to pay back the service of Filipinos through veterans benefits was reversed by the Rescission Acts of 1946 (Public Laws 79-301 and 79-391; 60 Stat. 6 and 60 Stat. 221), which deemed that the wartime service of the Commonwealth Army of the Philippines and the new Philippine Scouts was not considered active and, therefore, did not qualify for benefits.

(20) The loyal and valiant Filipino Veterans of World War II fought, suffered, and, in many instances, died in the same manner and under the same commander as other members of the United States Armed Forces during World War II.

(21) The Filipino Veterans of World War II fought alongside, and as an integral part of, the United States Armed Forces. The Philippines remained a territory of the United States for the duration of the war and, accordingly, the United States maintained sovereignty over Philippine foreign relations, including Philippine laws enacted by the Philippine Government. Filipinos who fought in the Philippines were not only defending or fighting for the Philippines, but also defending, and ultimately liberating, sovereign territory held by the United States Government.

(22) The United States remains forever indebted to the bravery, valor, and dedication that the Filipino Veterans of World War II displayed. Their commitment and sacrifice demonstrates a highly uncommon and commendable sense of patriotism and honor.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(a) the term "Filipino Veterans of World War II" includes any individual who served—

(1) honorably at any time during the period beginning on July 26, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946;

(2) in an active-duty status under the command of the United States Armed Forces in the Far East; and

(3)(A) within the Philippine Commonwealth Army, the Philippine Scouts, the Philippine Constabulary, Recognized Guerrilla units, the New Philippine Scouts, the First Filipino Infantry Regiment, the Second Filipino Infantry Battalion (Separate), or the First Reconnaissance Battalion; or

(B) commanding or serving in a unit described in paragraph (3)(A) as a United States military officer or enlisted soldier; and

(b) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 4. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design to the Filipino Veterans of World War II in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary shall strike the Gold Medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal in honor of the Filipino Veterans of World War II, the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it will be available for display as appropriate and made available for research.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution should make the gold medal received under paragraph (1) available for display elsewhere, particularly at other appropriate locations associated with the Filipino Veterans of World War II.

(d) DUPLICATE MEDALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Under regulations that the Secretary may promulgate, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under this Act, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

(2) SALE OF DUPLICATE MEDALS.—The amounts received from the sale of duplicate medals under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—Medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

CELEBRATING THE 140TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 532, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 532) celebrating the 140th anniversary of the State of Colorado.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 532) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 533, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 533) designating July 26, 2016, as "United States Intelligence Professionals Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 533) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 534, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 534) relative to the death of William L. Armstrong, former United States Senator for the State of Colorado.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 534) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 10, H.R. 4465, H.R. 4487, AND H.R. 4901

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I understand that there are four bills that have been received from the House and are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title en bloc for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 10) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 4465) to decrease the deficit by consolidating and selling Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 4487) to reduce costs of Federal real estate, improve building security, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 4901) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 14, 2016

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 14; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the majority leader be recognized as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Senators should expect four rollcall votes at 11:30 tomorrow morning as well as one additional vote after lunch.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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 under the provisions of S. Res. 534 as a further mark of respect to William L. Armstrong, former United States Senator from Colorado.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:04 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 14, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

GRANT T. HARRIS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN A. LANCASTER, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

BENJAMIN OSORIO, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022, VICE MARIA ROSARIO JACKSON, TERM EXPIRING.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

MARY ELLEN BARBERA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2018, VICE JONATHAN LIPPMAN, TERM EXPIRED.

JOHN D. MINTON, JR., OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2016, VICE JAMES R. HANNAH.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

JANNETTE LAKE DATES, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2022. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOSEPH R. DONOVAN JR., OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

CONSTANCE SMITH BARKER, OF ALABAMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2021. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

JOHN A. HERRERA, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 10, 2021, VICE DEBORAH MATZ, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. AUNDRE F. PIGGEE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. CHARLES A. RICHARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PHILIP G. HOWE

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

STEVEN S. ALEXANDER
BRIAN RANSOM BACKUS
MARTIN ANDREW BAIN
ELIZABETH L. BARKER
DAVID W. BENNETT
MARGARET HELEN BLAIS
ROBERT LESTER BLOODWORTH
JEFFREY M. BONNER
KENNETH A. BORCHERS
BRETT BOSSELMANN
KARL SMITH BOWERS, JR.
DANIEL D. BOYACK
STEVE LAURENCE BRADLEY
RODNEY C. BRICKELL
DIANA MARIA BROWN
JOHN BRYK
ANDREW J. BURDA
MATTHEW D. CALHOUN
IRA STANLEY CAMPBELL
MICHAEL DAVID CHASE
JASON S. CHRISTMAN
JOHN A. CLUCK
JOHN ROBERT CONNOLLY
RONALD WAYNE CROUCH
JOHN JAMES DABBY
NANCY M. DAKIN
DANIEL ANDREW DANCZYK
CHRISTOPHER D. DAVIS
ROSS PATRICK DICKINSON
LEON JOSEPH DODROE
JON D. DRIELING
CHRISTOPHER M. DUNLAP
DANIEL M. FESLER
FRANK T. GIAMBATTISTA
IAN J. M. GILLIS
LISA ANN GODSEY
TODD M. GRAHAM
DARREN F. GRAY
MATTHEW M. GROVES
MARK TERRELL GUILLORY
JAMES MARTIN HAGAR
KENNETH M. HALTOM
THOMAS C. HANNON
TROY D. HAVENER
JAMES P. HENDREN
KAREN L. HENDRICKSON
JOHN S. HENNESSEE
MATTHEW ELLIS HENRY
CHRISTOPHER L. HESSE
BRIAN L. HOLLEY
SHAYNA M. HOLMAN

MICHAEL D. HOLMES
ALBEN N. HOPKINS, JR.
GREGORY E. HOPKINS
DAVID MICHAEL HOUGHLAND
TOMMY W. HOWARD
HAYLEY HUGHES
KEVIN EARL JACOBS
JOHN W. JOHNSTON, JR.
DAVID CALDWELL JONES
SAMUEL CALLAHAN KEENER
PAUL M. KELL
DAVID E. KIMPEL
KURT K. KINDSCHUH
STANLEY JOSEPH KRASOVIC, JR.
STEVEN SCOTT LAMBRECHT
CHRISTOPHER E. LANTAGNE
DAVID A. LARSEN
LARRY DEAN LAYNE
ANDREW M. LEGEAR
GRACE LINK
RODDY S. LOCHALA
LORETTA JEAN LOMBARD
KENNETH LOZANO
VICTOR R. MACIAS
JODY CHRISTOPHER MAHLER
BERNADETTE MALDONADO
DAVID WAYNE MANSON
MICHAEL A. MATHEWS
WILLIAM G. MAYLES, SR.
GREGORY E. MCDONALD
TARA D. MCKENNIE
ROBERT DANIEL MICHALAK, JR.

ALLISON C. MILLER
JAMES D. MITCHELL
SCOTT A. MORRIS
TIMOTHY P. MURPHY
TODD W. NADEAU
ROBERT K. NASH
MITCHELL ALAN NEFF
DAVID M. NELSON
WILLIAM A. NERI
BYRON B. NEWELL
JOHN R. NEWMAN
DEBORAH SUE OWENS
JAMES R. PARRY
TIMOTHY E. PERTUIS
STEVEN L. POULOS, JR.
JOSEPH ANTEZANA QUINN
ILEANA RAMIREZ-PEREZ
HENRY HORMIDAS RENAUD III
ZERRICK RICHEY
MATTHEW GEORGE RIPPEN
EDWIN RIVERA ANGELL
JORI A. ROBINSON
JASON BENEDICT RUDD
ROBERT MITCHELL SAGE
CHRISTIAN ERIC SANDER
JENNIFER L. SCHMIDT
JOSE L. SERRANO
RICHARD O. SEYMOUR
KEVIN S. SLAUGHTER
DAVID JOHN SMITH
DAVID JOSEPH SPEHAR
RONALD N. SPEIR, JR.
STANLEY LOUIS STEFANCIC III
KEVIN BRYAN STJOHN
KENNETH L. STONE
SEAN S. SULLIVAN
ROBERT BRANDON TAYLOR
DANIEL NELS TESTER
STEVEN RALPH THOMAS
JOHN RICHARD TROVATO
CHRISTOPHER ALEXANDER TUMILOWICZ
DAVID N. UNRUH
RUSTY JAY VAIRA
ERIC DARREN WADE
DAVID M. WARNICK
STACEY SCOTT ZDANAVAGE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ANDRELL J. HARDY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

HECTOR I. MARTINEZPINEIRO

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

SUZANNE L. HOPKINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KENRIC T. ABAN
SHANNON P. ADAMS
BRYAN T. ALVAREZ
RYAN D. ARNOLD
JAMES R. BAILEY
SHAWN A. BELVERUD
SHANNON R. BLACKMER
MARK E. BOMIA
MATTHEW J. BRADLEY

APRIL L. BREEDEN
DAREN R. BROOKS
KRISTIN M. BROWSKE
TIMOTHY M. BURKHART
JEREMIAH D. BURNETT
MELISSA A. BURYK
JACOB J. CARMICHAEL
ALDEN V. CHIU
FRANCESCA M. CIMINO
WILLIAM T. COBB II
PETER M. COLE
DERRICK H. COLMENAR
SEAN P. CONLEY
BRADLEY K. DRAPENBAUGH
ADAM C. DEISING
KRISTINA M. DELAROSA
CHADWICK J. DONALDSON
THOMAS J. DOUGLAS III
JONATHAN D. ERPENBACH
TODD A. FELLARS
DOMINICK R. FERNANDEZ
JOSEPH D. FITZPATRICK
MICHAEL A. FORTUNATO
DAVID T. FOSTER
MATTHEW E. GAFFIGAN
ROBERT M. GALLAGHER
TERREL L. GALLOWAY
SHAWN M. S. GARCIA
JOSHUA A. GARLAND
GREGORY A. GATES
JAMES T. GILSON
TIFANI L. GLEESON
CAVIN H. GLENN
RYAN T. GOCKE
SARA C. GONZALEZ
MARIA L. GRAUERHOLZ
TODD E. GREGORY
STACY S. GRIFFIN
ERIK T. GROSSGOLD
COREY G. GUSTAFSON
JAMES E. HANFORD
ROBERT B. HANSEN
REED M. HECKERTEL
VIJAY G. HEGDE
JASON L. HENRY
MARYJO J. HESSERT
INGRID E. HODEN
JAMES W. HODGES III
ROY A. HOFFMAN
EDWARD S. HURD
SHERRY J. ILLINSKI
CHRISTOPHER S. JOAS
MELANIE D. JOHANSSON
MICHAEL B. KIM
JOSEPH G. KOTORA
MATTHEW A. KUETTTEL
JUSTIN P. LAFRENIERE
JOHN E. LAIRD
RICHARD S. LANGTON
ROBERT D. LAWSON
LANCE E. LECLERE
JESSICA J. LEE
JASON R. LEFRINGHOUSE
ANDREW G. LETIZIA
STEPHEN L. LEWIS
JAMES M. LIANG
THUY K. LIN
RHONDA A. LIZEWSKI
DAYNA T. LOBRAICO
ROBERT E. LOVERK
TAKMAN E. MACK
GAVIN C. MCEWAN
NANCY L. MILLER
LISA M. MONDZELEWSKI
DEEPTI S. MOON
JEREMY P. MOORE
TOD A. MORRIS
CHRISTOPHER D. NGUYEN
DANA J. ONIPEL
EAMON B. OREILLY
JASON P. PALMER
SANGHEE D. PARK
GRETCHEN E. PATTISON
ADAM D. PERRY
ANDREW J. PHILIP
CALEB J. PODRAZA
MICHAEL PRUD'HOME
KRISTA M. PUTTLER
ERIK L. RAMEY
JOHN J. ROBERTS
GLENDA B. ROBLES
DAVID M. ROGERS
ELLIOT M. ROSS
C. C. SCHULTHEISS
AMANDA R. SELF
PETER J. SILVESTRI
MARVIN J. SKLAR
MICHAEL R. SMILEY
ASHER O. SMITH
LINDA C. D. SMITH
MICHAEL IS. STARSIAK
TODD H. STERLING
KRISTIN A. STEVENS
BRADLEY M. TAYLOR
SCOTT M. TINTLE
ROBERT W. TRACEY
MARK P. TSCHANZ
SAMUEL D. TURNER
JAMES C. VALENTINE, JR.
TERRIN W. VELAZQUEZ
ROBERT A. WALTZ
TYLER E. WARKENTIEN
SCOTT A. WELCH
JANET M. WEST
ADDISON G. WILSON, JR.
ERIC H. YEUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BRENT N. ADAMS
ROMAN G. ALLEN
KATHRYN A. BARBARA
DAVID G. BENTLEY
CARLIS W. BROWN
JUSTIN S. CAMPBELL
COLEMAN C. CHANDLER, JR.
LAKESHA A. CHEEVES
ROLLIN S. CLAYTON
TIFFANY F. CLINE
TIMOTHY J. COKER
DARLA M. DIETRICH
ERICH J. DIETRICH
BRIAN D. ENGRESSER
BENJAMIN J. ESPINOSA
JOHN P. EVANS
TIMOTHY W. FERRELL
THOMAS C. FOSTER
AARON J. FRANK
ROBERT D. GOAD
VINCENT J. GRIMM
BRIAN M. HOWER
THOMAS C. JONES
MATTHEW R. KASPER
KYLE E. KEE
JO M. KITCHENS
STACY L. KWAK
JAMES C. LONG
SUSAN MALBOEUF
MATTHEW P. MARCINKIEWICZ
STEPHEN A. MARTY
DARION MCCULLOUGH
RONNIE R. MCGILLVERY
JARED A. MCKENDALL
ALICE P. MOSS
KIMBERLY A. MUSA
TATIANA M. OLSON
ERIC R. PARSONS
JOSHUA M. PORTON
JEREMY S. PYLES
LINH H. QUACH
TINSIKA I. RIGGS
LARRY J. SCHMIEGE
JASON P. SCHMITTSCHMITT
TIFFANY L. SCOTT
EMILY J. SPRAGUE
RICHARD C. STACEY
JEFFREY E. SUBA
KAREN M. SUPTKO
BOBBIE J. TURNER
STACIE L. TURNER
DAVID A. VEENHUIS
DAREN A. VERHULST
JENNIFER C. WALLINGER
CHRISTY A. C. WEIMER
WILFRED H. WELLS
ARCELIA WICKER
CHARLES R. WILHITE
MAYA WILLIAMS
MARJORIE A. WYTZKA
EMILY L. ZYWICKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

TERESITA ALSTON
CASEY J. BURNS
MITCHELL R. CHECCHI
MICHAEL B. FLANNERY
JOSEPH J. FRANZKE
FREDERIC GIAUQUE
BRACKEN R. GODFREY
KEVIN W. HAVEMAN
JEREMY D. HAYES
JOSHUA F. HENSON
JEFFREY W. HILLEY
MONSERRAT JORDEN
GREGORY L. KOONTZ
SARAH T. LAWSON
MAX P. MONCAYO
SCOTT A. PASIETA
ANGELA M. ROLDANWHITAKER
JENNIFER L. SMITH
RAYMOND F. TINUCCI
VINH T. TON
NICOLE G. WARD
KIRSTIN C. WIER
LING YE
ERIN K. ZIZAK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

DYLAN T. BURCH
DEREK BUTLER
LIAM A. CONNELL
SARA R. DINGRODT
TIMOTHY M. FLINTOFT
JONATHAN T. FLYNN
TREVOR J. GRANT
JUSTIN L. HAWKS
MATTHEW W. IVEY
BARBARA A. KAGLE
CHRISTOPHER P. KIMBALL
JAMES H. KIRBY
TRACY D. KIRBY
PATRICK L. LAHIFF
CHARLES M. LAYNE

GEORGE W. LUCIER
JUSTIN MCEWEN
DONALD R. OSTROM
GERALDO PADILLA
BRADLEY S. PARKER
EDWARD M. PIERCE
JUSTIN PILLING
ERIN C. QUAY
MICHELE V. ROSEN
MARYANN M. STAMPFLI
SEAN M. SULLIVAN
CHAD C. TEMPLE
JAMES M. TOOHEY
LUKE A. WHITTEMORE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BROOKE M. BASFORD
ARIC V. BAUDEK
TROY J. BAUMANNFREUND
BRIAN B. BEALE
CONSTANCE BEALE
VAVADEE V. BELKO
GLENN A. BRADFORD
KATHLEEN M. CAFFREY
KEITH G. DOBBINS
KRISTIN L. EDGAR
NEVA R. FUENTES
DAVID R. GOODRICH
JOHN B. GORE
JERRI M. GRAY
JAMES L. HAPFNER, JR.
PAULO M. HERNANDEZ
KYLE D. HINDS
ERIC M. HOYER
FREDERICK L. HUSS, JR.
PATRIELLE R. JOHNSON
MELISSA M. KENNEDY
ERIC J. KULHAN
CASSANDRA M. LEATE
JASON S. LITCHFIELD
CHRISTINA B. LUMBA
CATHERINE A. LUNA
TRACY M. MCCULLOUGH
TARA N. MCGINNIS
DAVID J. MCINTIRE
CHRISTIAN T. MELENDEZ
JENNIFER L. MILLER
MERIDETH L. MILLER
SUSAN L. MOJICA
MARY R. MORTIMER
ANDREW R. ODEA
CARLA A. PAPPALARDO
REMY R. PASCUAL
SHAWN R. PASSONS
HOLLY M. PEREZ
RICHARD A. POZNIAK, JR.
ANGELICA M. PUCHA
KENNETT D. RADFORD
MARDDI J. RAHN
ANN M. RANIEWSKI
JAMES M. REILLY
RODOLFO G. SANJUAN
EDGAR O. SANLUIS
MISTY D. SCHEEL
HEATHER A. SHATTUCK
ELIZABETH J. SHAUBELL
JOHN SINCLAIR
DENITA J. SKEET
JAMES C. SPRADLING
KATHRYN M. R. STEWART
AMY M. STONE
CHRISTINA L. TELLEZ
JAMES C. TESSIER
TONY TORRES
CRAIG A. TYSON, SR.
TIFFANY A. URANGA
TARAIL VERNON
TRACY L. VINCENT
RIVKA L. WEISS
EDUARDO C. WELDON
MALISSA D. WICKERSHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

RYAN P. ANDERSON
MICHAEL AUGUSTINE
ANTHONY P. BANNISTER
BISHOYE A. BOLARINWA
CHRISTIAN K. BOOTH
BRADLEY C. CARRILL
CHRISTIN E. CROWLEY
STEPHEN A. DARRING
DEBORAH K. DAVISREID
RODECE L. DEAN
JERETTA R. DILLON
RUSTIN J. DOZEMAN
RUSSELL L. ELLIS
JOSH A. ELSTON
AMY A. EVANGELISTA
PAUL E. FOX
TIMOTHY R. FREEMAN
JOHN A. FRENCH
PETER F. HARRINGTON
JASON E. HASIS
JOSHUA M. HEIVLY
JOHN M. HENSON
ANDREW E. HENWOOD
DANA M. HERBERT
JOSHUA R. HILL
DOUGLAS R. JENKINS

BARI J. JONES
DAVID K. JONES, JR.
ALEXANDER P. KACZUR
FRANK D. KIM
ROBERT G. KOVACK, JR.
WALTER W. KULZY
JOSHUA T. LANCASTER
EVELYN C. LEE
SCOTT J. LEWIS
ALVARO LUNA
APRIL E. MALVEO
LLAHN A. MCGHIE
ALLEN H. MCKIBBEN II
KEVIN S. MCNULTY
CHARLES M. MIELKIE III
MARK D. MILLIUS
JAMES M. NEWTON
ANDREW J. OSWALD
JAMES T. PERRY, JR.
BRUCE M. REILLY II
PAMELA R. SAUCEDO
FRANK W. SHERMAN
MONICA R. TATE
DANIEL J. VETSCH
LARRY S. WALLACE
RACHELE A. WHARTON
SCOTT A. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JENNIFER D. BOWDEN
ALLEN K. BROOKS
JOHN A. CARTER
CHRISTOPHER S. CAUBLE
DAVID J. CULLEN III
JAISEN E. FUSON
MARK A. GIRALMO
FERGUSON L. HARRIS
CHRIS E. HESTER
BRIAN L. JACOBSON
CYNTHIA L. KANE
JAY J. KERSTEN
KURT A. MICHAELIS
ALFRED V. PENA
JAMES M. PEUGH
JEFFREY QUINN
STEVEN L. ROBERTS
MARK A. ROGERS
PAUL N. RUMERY
CLIFFORD P. RUTLEDGE
LESLIE K. SIAS
DAVID L. SLATER
WILLIAM N. SOLOMON
THOMAS J. STATLER
WILLIAM M. STEWART, JR.
STEVEN E. STOUARD
DAVID A. STROUD
GARRY R. THORNTON, JR.
MATTHEW S. WEEMS
ARTHUR L. WIGGINS, JR.
ROBERT B. WILLS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BRADLEY M. BAER
JOHN H. BEATTIE
SCOTT N. BEYER
BEAU BROOKS
JOHN C. BROWN
MICHAEL W. CARR II
KENDALL C. CHAPMAN
RICHARD R. CONTRERAS, JR.
JASON P. FAHY
BRIAN L. FOSTER
JOHN D. HERRIN
JONATHAN L. HIGDON
KENNETH F. HONEK
MICHAEL M. JAROSZ
JARED A. JASINSKI
CHRIS D. KIM
DEBRA E. KING
JASON H. LOCKHART
DAVID M. MAT'VAY, JR.
JONATHAN D. NIEMAN
STEPHEN T. PADHI
ADAM S. PERRINS
RICHARD J. POCHOLSKI
MATTHEW A. RICHARDSON
WALTER C. SIBLEY
KENT R. SIMODYNES
MICHAEL S. SINGLETON
JAMES R. SULLIVAN
MATTHEW C. TOLHURST
AARON M. TURKE
ROBERT A. WADSWORTH
BENJAMIN V. WAINWRIGHT
GRANT H. WATANABE
MATTHEW T. WILLIAMS
WILLIAM W. WOHREAD
GREGORY J. WOODS

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR APPOINTMENT AS A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DIANA ISABEL ACOSTA, OF NEW YORK
REBECCA REYES ACUNA, OF TEXAS
JACK M. ADRIEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ALEXANDER JOSEPH ALBERTINE, OF OREGON
 FATIMA ALI-KARAGOL, OF VIRGINIA
 MICHAEL ASHKOURI, OF VIRGINIA
 LUIS AZURDUY, OF FLORIDA
 COURTNEY WELLS BABCOCK, OF NEW YORK
 MONICA BANSAL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ROBERT A. BEADLE, OF MARYLAND
 KAI AYANNA ISOM BEARD, OF GEORGIA
 AMBER BECHTE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 KATHRYN BEGEAL, OF FLORIDA
 BEYOLA BELZLAIRE, OF FLORIDA
 JOHN F. BERNON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 SARAH J. BERRY, OF VIRGINIA
 SARAH BIEBER, OF CALIFORNIA
 MARY GRAHAM BLISS, OF VIRGINIA
 NYA KWAI STERLING BOAYUE, OF GEORGIA
 MICHAEL BRADOW, OF VIRGINIA
 CLINTON JAMES BRANAM, OF MARYLAND
 ESTHER BROBESONG, OF CALIFORNIA
 ELIZABETH LEIGH BROWN, OF CALIFORNIA
 DAVID BROWNE, OF ILLINOIS
 ANAFRIDA NESTORY BWENGE, OF FLORIDA
 BRYAN THOMAS BYRNE, OF ILLINOIS
 GINA MARIE CADY, OF FLORIDA
 SHERI L. CAHILL, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 ALBERT E. CARRERA, OF CALIFORNIA
 JAVIER O. CASTANO, OF FLORIDA
 JORGE A. CASTRO, OF NEW JERSEY
 ROBERT HOWARD CLAUSSEN, OF NEVADA
 ELIZABETH M. COLARIK, OF FLORIDA
 BEATRICE MARIE CONDE, OF FLORIDA
 PETER M. CRONIN, OF FLORIDA
 HEATHER APRIL D'AGNES, OF ALABAMA
 DIANA NIMEH DAIBES, OF OREGON
 CHARLES AASGAARD DAVIS, OF MINNESOTA
 CHRISTOPHER JOHN DEGE, OF WASHINGTON
 AMY QUINN DIALLO, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 MICHAEL A. DILLARD, OF TENNESSEE
 WHITNEY ALENA DUBINSKY, OF VIRGINIA
 SUZANNE KAY EBERT, OF NEBRASKA
 BOULANIE ADETOKUNBO EBEPE, OF NEW YORK
 BRYAN J. ENSLEIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 REBECCA B. FERTZIGER, OF CALIFORNIA
 SIENA B. C. FLEISCHER, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 JOSEPHINE E. V. FRANCISCO, OF CALIFORNIA
 ANNE MARIE O. FRERE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ASHLEY E. FROST, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 SHAMENNA KAIEHUMANUOKALANIOKEALOHA GALL, OF HAWAII
 FELICIA GENET, OF CALIFORNIA
 JASON J. GILPIN, OF FLORIDA
 LAURA ELAINE GONZALES, OF CALIFORNIA
 PATRICK WINFELD GODWIN, OF FLORIDA
 NICHOLE R. GRABER-SIMMONS, OF CALIFORNIA
 PHILLIP P. GREENE, OF MINNESOTA
 MIGUEL EDGAR SINEWING GUARDIAN, OF NEVADA
 BETH A. HAIN, OF VIRGINIA
 WILLIAM K. HALL, OF VIRGINIA
 CATHERINE CYBELA HAMLIN, OF TENNESSEE
 DANIEL I. HANDEL, OF NEW JERSEY
 KALIM HANNA, OF FLORIDA
 ELIZABETH ANNE HAYTMANEK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 CARTER ARMSTRONG HEMPHILL, OF TEXAS
 MAYCHIN HO, OF WISCONSIN
 CHRISTOPHER M. HYNAK, OF VIRGINIA
 GEZIM HYSENAGOLLI, OF NEW YORK
 SUZIE LUCILLE JACINTHE, OF NEW YORK
 MIRANDA GEORGIA JOLICOEUR, OF RHODE ISLAND
 ALEXIS JONES, OF VIRGINIA
 JESSE B. JOSEPH, OF VIRGINIA
 HANNA JUNG, OF WASHINGTON
 LEAH KAPLAN, OF TENNESSEE
 MERAL KARAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 NICHOLAS D. KAUFMAN, OF OREGON
 SAMBA ANSUMANA KAWA, OF MARYLAND
 MARK CHRISTOPHER KELLY, OF TEXAS
 LEVLA S. KESTER, OF NORTH CAROLINA
 SAMUEL DESRIE KOUAME, OF NEW YORK
 MANISH ANDREW KUMAR, OF COLORADO
 MEGAN ERIN KYLES, OF CALIFORNIA
 MICHELLE M. LANG-ALLI, OF TEXAS
 CHRISTINA M. L. LANG, OF HAWAII
 JANET K. LAWSON, OF ILLINOIS
 VERONICA E. LEE, OF NEW JERSEY
 WARREN DENNIS LEISHMAN, OF WASHINGTON
 JUDE SUSAN LEITTEN, OF FLORIDA
 AUDRA DEGESYS LYKOS, OF OHIO
 REGINA BURNS MACKENZIE, OF VIRGINIA
 RUTH N. MADISON, OF VIRGINIA
 SIDI JILALI MAGHRAOUTI, OF FLORIDA
 ANDERS J. MANTTIUS, OF FLORIDA
 TAMIKA LEE MARTIN, OF TEXAS
 GUY MARTORANA, OF TEXAS
 DARYL MARTYRIS, OF VIRGINIA
 SHAYONNA M. MAXWELL, OF NEW YORK
 MELODY R. MCNEIL, OF TEXAS
 LORRI ANNE MELLIS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 GAGIL MELKUMYAN, OF CALIFORNIA
 ALEFIA A. MERCHANT, OF CALIFORNIA
 RAPHAEL METZGER, OF CALIFORNIA
 SEBASTIAN J. MILARDO, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 FAIGE LYNN MILLER, OF WISCONSIN
 AUSTAN MOGHARABI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 LINDSEY MOORE, OF NEW YORK
 JESSICA REENE MORRISON, OF TENNESSEE
 JACOB MICHAEL MUELLER, OF FLORIDA
 GABRIEL ERIC NARANJO, OF TEXAS
 JENNIFER MARIE NIKLAEFF, OF TEXAS
 MAGGIE NORTHMAN, OF CALIFORNIA
 ENID ALEIDA NUNEZ, OF FLORIDA
 MAURA ANNE O'BRIEN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 TARA NICHOLE O'DAY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 MARIKA ANNE OLSON, OF NEW MEXICO
 APRIL A. O'NEILL, OF WASHINGTON
 YASSIN CHALIF OSMAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 KAIL M. PADGITT, OF VIRGINIA

MICHELLE STEPHANIE PARKER, OF FLORIDA
 LISA PATEL, OF CALIFORNIA
 BROOKE NORTH PATTERSON, OF WASHINGTON
 R. CLARK PEARSON, OF FLORIDA
 ANH NGUYEN PHAM, OF CALIFORNIA
 JENNIFER PIKE, OF FLORIDA
 EWA PIOTROWSKA, OF VIRGINIA
 CHRISTOPHER POWERS, OF FLORIDA
 PRZEMEK PRASZCZALEK, OF TEXAS
 C. XAVIER PRECIADO, OF CALIFORNIA
 ANTHONY RIVERA RANESSES, OF VIRGINIA
 KRISTIN MICHELLE RAY, OF MARYLAND
 R. ANDREW READ, OF MISSOURI
 LAUREN DIANE REAGAN, OF WASHINGTON
 KERRY S. REEVES, OF TEXAS
 RASHEENA ANN REID, OF TEXAS
 KARLA KAYE ROBERTS CAMP, OF TEXAS
 OMAR ROBLES, OF PUERTO RICO
 WILLIAM S. RODEN III, OF ALABAMA
 ERICA ROUNSEFELL, OF OREGON
 CHRISTOPHER JOHN RUDOLPH, OF TEXAS
 STEVEN JAMES RYNECKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 JOHN GATES SAHN, OF ILLINOIS
 JEAN WESNEL CAMILLEN SAINT-CYR, OF NEW YORK
 KEVIN T. SARSO, OF ILLINOIS
 CAEL H. SAVAGE, OF OREGON
 TRISHA SAVAGE, OF OREGON
 HOLLY SUE SCHIPPERS, OF MICHIGAN
 LYNN M. SCHNEIDER, OF WASHINGTON
 WILLIAM ANTHONY SEDLAK, OF WASHINGTON
 KEN ANTHONY SEIFERT, OF TEXAS
 JASON ROBERT SEUC, OF FLORIDA
 PATRICIA GORLAND SIASO, OF FLORIDA
 JARROD ZEBULON SIMPSON, OF TEXAS
 KAREN TRACY SMITH, OF CALIFORNIA
 JENNIFER JILL SNELL, OF ARIZONA
 MARK G. SORENSEN, OF VIRGINIA
 RACHEL ELIZABETH SOREY, OF VIRGINIA
 CRISTINA E. VELEZ SRINIVASAN, OF TEXAS
 NANCY RHEA STEEDLE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 DAVID ISAAC STONEHILL, OF CALIFORNIA
 ANTOINETTE MARIA SULLIVAN, OF LOUISIANA
 KIPP FREEMAN SUTTON, OF CALIFORNIA
 JENNA ROSE TAJCHMAN, OF KANSAS
 ETHAN N. TAKAHASHI, OF TEXAS
 MARK H. TEGENFELDT, OF VIRGINIA
 MICHAEL TESKE, OF FLORIDA
 KIMBERLY A. THOMPSON, OF OREGON
 DANIEL G. THOMSON, OF WASHINGTON
 MARTIN ALEXANDER THURN, OF FLORIDA
 TROY J. TILLIS, OF ILLINOIS
 KATHY M. TIN, OF CALIFORNIA
 THAO PHUONG MAI TRAN, OF TEXAS
 WILLIAM EDWARD THOMAS TRIGG, OF NEVADA
 SAMUEL A. R. TURANO, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 BERT C. UBAMADU, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 LAURA GETTA UHL, OF NEW YORK
 PATRICIA A. VARGAS, OF FLORIDA
 ELIZABETH ANNE WAGER, OF OREGON
 ELIZABETH LEE WALKER, OF FLORIDA
 LISA MICHELLE WALKER, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 GREGORY S. WANG, OF MISSOURI
 EMILY DANIELLE WAYTOTI, OF FLORIDA
 DAVID WESTERLING, OF MISSOURI
 JEREMY TILDEN WILLIAMMEE, OF VIRGINIA
 GARTH MICHAEL WILLIS, OF MINNESOTA
 ELIZABETH MEGAN WILLIS, OF CALIFORNIA
 MONICA P. WISNER, OF TENNESSEE
 MICHELLE DAPRA WITTENBERGER, OF FLORIDA
 BRIAN K. WITTNEBEL, OF NEW YORK
 PUI MAN WONG, OF CALIFORNIA
 SHAWN J. WOZNAK, OF MICHIGAN
 ASTA M. ZINBO, OF FLORIDA
 ELISA JOELLE ZOGBI, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR APPOINTMENT AS A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JENNISA PAREDES, OF FLORIDA
 EDWARD PEAY, OF NEW JERSEY
 LAURA ROUSSEAU, OF VIRGINIA
 JACOB RUTZ, OF MINNESOTA
 JAMORAL TWINE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 13, 2016:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

CARLA D. HAYDEN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS FOR A TERM OF TEN YEARS.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) CHRISTIAN D. BECKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRUCE L. GILLINGHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TROY M. MCCLELLAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER ARTICLE II, SECTION 2, CLAUSE 2, OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RONNY L. JACKSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVY RESERVE AND APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5143:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. LUKE M. MCCOLLUM

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEVEN M. SHEPRO

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. TAMMY S. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BRIAN E. ALVIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICHARD J. HEITKAMP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MILES A. DAVIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. FLETCHER V. WASHINGTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. NIKKI L. GRIFFIN OLIVE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DARIUS BANAJI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TINA A. DAVIDSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. GAYLE D. SHAFFER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. FRANK D. WHITWORTH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. STEPHANIE T. KECK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID A. GOGGINS

CAPT. DOUGLAS W. SMALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RICHARD D. HEINZ
 CAPT. JOHN T. PALMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CARL P. CHEBI
 CAPT. BLAKE L. CONVERSE
 CAPT. CHARLES B. COOPER II
 CAPT. PAUL T. DRUGGAN
 CAPT. DONALD D. GABRIELSON
 CAPT. ALVIN HOLSEY
 CAPT. JEFFREY T. JABLON
 CAPT. GARY A. MAYES
 CAPT. JOHN F. MEIER
 CAPT. JAMES E. PITTS
 CAPT. CHARLES W. ROCK
 CAPT. JOHN B. SKILLMAN
 CAPT. MURRAY J. TYNCH III
 CAPT. JOHN F. WADE
 CAPT. MICHAEL A. WETTLAUFER

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WALTER W.
 BEAN AND ENDING WITH SCOTT L. RUMMAGE, WHICH
 NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
 PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18,
 2016.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER
 D. BANKSTON AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM F. WOLFE,
 WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE
 AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON
 MAY 18, 2016.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD D.
 BETZOLD AND ENDING WITH JENNIFER E. TONNESON,
 WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE
 AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON
 JUNE 28, 2016.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEFANIE
 L. SHAVER AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM J. BRIDGHAM,
 WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE
 AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON
 JUNE 28, 2016.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF EROL AGI, TO BE LIEUTEN-
 ANT COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOSHUA D. WRIGHT, TO BE
 COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PHILLIP W. NEAL, TO BE LIEU-
 TENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NATHAN D. SCHROEDER, TO BE
 MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RENEE V. SCOTT, TO BE MAJOR.
 ARMY NOMINATION OF KEITH D. BLODGETT, TO BE
 COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY M. AL-
 STON AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. TURLEY, WHICH
 NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
 PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 28,
 2016.

ARMY NOMINATION OF STEVEN C. LOOS, TO BE MAJOR.
 ARMY NOMINATION OF DANIEL W. M. MACKLE, TO BE
 COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL P. LINDSAY, TO BE
 MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRANDO S. JOBITY, TO BE
 MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID C. MARTIN, TO BE
 MAJOR.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GREGORY A.
 VERLINDE AND ENDING WITH DAVID T. WRIGHT, WHICH
 NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
 PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 7,
 2016.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COLLEGIATE BASEBALL NAMES
KATY ATHLETE, JON
DUPLANTIER AS AN ALL-AMER-
ICA PITCHER

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Katy native, Jon Duplantier, for being named as an All-America pitcher by Collegiate Baseball magazine.

Jon Duplantier graduated from Seven Lakes High School in 2013 and is currently a junior attending the great Rice University. Duplantier has been drafted and picked to pitch for the Arizona Diamondbacks. Duplantier was named the C-USA Pitcher of the week three times, National pitcher of the Week and has faced six nationally ranked teams. Duplantier has displayed great discipline and dedication, we are proud to have such talent representing our Katy community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Jon Duplantier for his outstanding athletic achievements. We wish him success in his baseball career and look forward to rooting for him in majors. Katy, Texas is proud of him.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES L. KNOTT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate Dr. James L. Knott of Council Bluffs, Iowa, for his interest in the local history of Council Bluffs and Pottawattamie County, Iowa. Dr. Knott wrote two books, *Gateway to the West: A History of Council Bluffs, Iowa and Mecca of the Midwest: A History of Lake Manawa Area*.

Dr. Knott retired in 1993 after 50 years of distinguished service practicing medicine in Council Bluffs and Omaha, Nebraska. He was accustomed to working 16 to 18 hours a day. Dr. Knott's retirement was short lived. He had a passion for history and decided that the only way to learn about Council Bluffs' past was to write a book. For the next 14 years, Dr. Knott researched the history of Council Bluffs and the surrounding areas because he felt there was no "first source" for those interested in the history of the area. The results of his efforts helped him write his two books on the local history of Council Bluffs. These books include local history and information on social, economic, and political events on various levels that has influenced the development of Council Bluffs.

I applaud Dr. James Knott for his dedication and desire to preserve the history of Council Bluffs, Iowa. I am proud to represent him in Congress. I know my colleagues in the U.S.

House of Representatives join me in congratulating Dr. Knott for his interest in publishing and sharing local history with his community. I wish him continued success in all his future endeavors.

HONORING NEW TOWN
MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize New Town Missionary Baptist Church in Charleston, MS inside of Tallahatchie County.

New Town Missionary Baptist Church was built in 1805; therefore the church is more than 150 years old. Like so many Black rural churches the history of New Town Missionary Baptist Church was passed down by word of mouth from members who were slaves. The church was built under the guidance of Spring Hill Baptist Church which was an all-white congregation. However, New Town Missionary Baptist Church (an all-Black congregation) was pastored by Rev. Porter, who was a white minister, until the church was successful in finding a Black minister who could lead. The Rev. Hampton Clemmons was the first Black pastor of the church.

The first building was a one room structure located where the Old New Town Cemetery is now. The following ministers have served as pastor of the church: Rev. Matthew Black, Rev. Neison Harris, Rev. William West, Rev. Willie Penn, Rev. Charlie Johnson, Rev. William Booker, Rev. Matthew Black (re-elected), Rev. P.R. Gipson, Rev. J.T. Brown, Rev. H.C. Jones, Rev. L.J. Jordan, Rev. R.S. Phamphlet, Rev. David B. Curry, and Rev. Derrick Williams, Sr. (current pastor). Some of the deacon members of the church were: Bro. James H. Reed, Bro. Burel Reed, Bro. James H. Bellamy, Bro. Robert E. Pollard, Bro. Nathan Metcalf, Bro. Richard Gray, Bro. Ben Thompson, Bro. Green Hudson, Bro. James Bellamy, Jr., Bro. Charlie Simmons, Bro. B.L. Reed, Bro. John H. Gray, Bro. Barney Willis, Bro. N.A. Boclair, Bro. Charlie Anderson, Bro. Jessie Terry, Bro. Minon Reed, Bro. S.N. Drake, Bro. Grafton Gray, Bro. John Winford, Bro. George Fair, Bro. James Frost, Bro. Roberson Jennings, Bro. Eckles Simmons, Bro. Frank Diltz, and Bro. Erwin Maynew.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the New Town Missionary Baptist Church in Charleston, MS in Tallahatchie County inside of the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE COLO-
RADO SPRINGS BUFFALO SOL-
DIER COMMUNITY MEMORIAL

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the new Buffalo Soldier Community Memorial in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

In 1866, Congress authorized the establishment of six all African-American units: the 9th and 10th Cavalry and 38th, 39th, 40th, and 41st Infantry Regiments—later reorganized as the 24th and 25th Infantry Regiments. These regiments were instrumental in the taming of the American West. Their primary missions were to protect settlers as they moved west as well as building the infrastructure necessary to support these new settlements. Unsurprisingly, these mandates were expanded upon meeting the realities of the frontier. These servicemen quickly found themselves assisting civil authorities in controlling mobs; pursuing outlaws and cattle thieves; providing protection for stage coaches; delivering the mail longer than the Pony Express; and serving as the first U.S. Border Patrol and National Park Rangers. One lesser known mission they completed was the mapping of the wilderness as the western development progressed.

During their tenure in Colorado, members of the 9th and 10th Cavalry and 24th and 25th Infantry Regiments were stationed at Fort Lyon and Fort Garland. These Buffalo Soldiers assisted civil authorities in peace-keeping efforts and participated in many important military conflicts in Colorado's territorial and early statehood history.

Between 1867 and 1907, 23 Medals of Honor were awarded as well as 40 Certificates of Merit for valor, endurance and courage. Buffalo Soldiers valiantly served during the Native American Wars, in the Spanish-American War, the Philippine-American War, the Mexican Expedition as well as World War I. Most impressively, these units had the lowest desertion rates in the Army.

I want to commend the Colorado Springs Buffalo Soldier Memorial Committee on their years-long quest to establish this Memorial. It is fitting that it will be dedicated during this year's 150th Anniversary of the inception of these units.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JUAN
RAMON GUERRERO

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Juan Ramon Guerrero, a resident of my district who lived in Orlando, Florida. Juan lost his life during the tragic shooting

● 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.

at Pulse nightclub on June 12, 2016. He was 22 years old.

Juan Ramon Guerrero was a third year student of finance at the University of Central Florida and worked part-time as a telemarketer. He is remembered as someone who was loved instantly by anyone who met him. He was always telling jokes and making people laugh. Juan came out to his family not long ago. For his upcoming birthday his family were planning a party, with his mother cooking his favorite foods.

Juan and his boyfriend, Christopher "Drew" Leinonen, lived together and had been dating for nearly two years. The Guerrero family were loving and accepting of Juan and Drew and their relationship. Juan's sister remembers that "They were so in love. They were soul mates. You could tell by how they looked at each other," she said. Juan and Drew were together at the club on the night of the shooting. They loved dancing, which is what brought them to the club that terrible night.

The two died together. Drew was 32.

The two families honored the love Juan and Drew shared with one another in a joint funeral service, a side-by-side farewell.

Juan Ramon Guerrero will never be forgotten in our pursuit of a more just and loving world. His memory, and his acts of kindness will live forever in the hearts and minds of those who knew him.

May his family, relatives and friends eventually find solace and comfort, and may he rest in eternal peace.

IN HONOR OF WANG CHENG-HAN

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Wang Cheng-Han, for his contributions and service in assisting U.S. soldiers in the liberation of the Weihsien Internment camp in August 1945.

Mr. Wang was a sophomore at Sichuan University when he joined the military service in December 1944. He was recruited into a telecommunications group where he learned Morse code and completed interpreter training classes.

At the age of 20, the American Office of Strategic Services assigned Wang as translator to a team of U.S. soldiers who were preparing to liberate the Weihsien Internment camp.

Weihsien Internment Camp was created by the Japanese in 1943 to hold westerners and other enemy nationals in North China. Once an American Presbyterian Compound, the Japanese transformed the location into a prison by adding electrified fencing, a moat, and armed security towers. Conditions in the camp were poor. Sanitary conditions were terrible, winters were harsh, and there was little food.

On August 17, 1945 Wang parachuted from a B-24 plane and helped liberate 1,500 Allied civilian prisoners from the camp. The mission was dangerous. Though the Japanese had officially surrendered, it was unknown whether Japanese soldiers in the area had received the order to surrender or would continue to fight.

The soldiers took over the Japanese headquarters building and received warm welcomes from the newly liberated prisoners. Among these prisoners was former New Jersey Assemblywoman Mary Previte. Wang's arrival at Weihsien provided much needed relief to the camp's malnourished prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, Wang Cheng-Han is a great individual who risked his life to save American lives. I join with all of New Jersey in honoring the selfless actions and service of this extraordinary man.

CARL ROGERS RETIREMENT

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my friend Representative Carl Rogers on his 22-year career in the state legislature and congratulate him on his retirement.

Carl Rogers represented Georgia's 29th District from 1995 to June 30, 2016. He served in both parties under 4 governors in the Georgia House, capping off his tenure as a Republican under longtime friend, Governor Nathan Deal.

Carl understood that what he did was not just a job, but a way of life. He put his whole heart into serving his constituents and the state of Georgia. For more than 20 years, he has been a highly respected and the very definition of a citizen legislator.

I would also like to commend Carl's wife, Linda. Linda has played an integral role, serving as Carl's aide and attending countless meetings and functions over the years. I know that Linda is looking forward to spending more, well-deserved, quality time with her husband of 49 years.

Carl and Linda Rogers have two grown children and seven grandchildren, one of whom, Hartley Carter, has served as an intern in both my Gainesville and Washington offices. Like a true Georgian, Carl is looking forward to taking his grandsons hunting and fishing, focusing on being a good father, grandfather, and husband.

I want to thank Representative Carl Rogers for the tremendous work he has done for the state of Georgia. We love you Carl and we wish you the best.

TRIBUTE TO PHYLLIS AND HAROLD SCHOLL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Phyllis and Harold Scholl on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary.

Phyllis and Harold were married on June 10, 1956 and reside in Adair, Iowa. Their lifelong commitment to each other and to six daughters, 14 grandchildren, 13 great-grandchildren and one great-great-grandchild truly

embodies Iowa's values. As the years pass, may their love continue to grow even stronger and may they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many more years to come.

I salute this lovely couple on their 60 years of life together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INSTITUTE OF INTERNAL AUDITORS

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) as they celebrate their 75th anniversary.

The art of auditing goes back centuries, but 1941 marked the beginning of concerted efforts to make internal auditing a recognized practice and fixture amongst governing bodies and management. In late 1941, IIA was incorporated and shortly thereafter, 24 internal auditors gathered in New York City to begin what would become a growing success across the decades. Currently, IIA has more than 180,000 active members worldwide, with 63,000 members residing here in the United States. Although the professional association has expanded over the years, the IIA remains committed to their goal of promoting the core principles, best practices, and highest ethical standards of internal auditing.

The words "internal audit" may sound strange and unfamiliar to most people. However, internal auditors play an important role in our society. As I have expressed in the past, auditors are required to tend "the stream," protecting the people by ensuring pollutants—or poor standards and practices—do not corrupt the free-market system. While their work is often unnoticed by the public at large and little thanks come their way, internal auditors' work in public and private organizations throughout the U.S. is integral to a smooth-running, prosperous society that benefits everyone.

It was this spirit of custodianship, dedication, and service that IIA has built and maintained over 75 years.

As a CPA, I understand the vital role that internal auditors play in maintaining accountability and transparency within our federal, state, and public institutions. Internal auditors provide independent assurances that an organization's risk management, governance, and internal control practices are working effectively and ethically. The IIA plays a pivotal part in helping auditors craft these skills through a variety of educational and development opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the achievements and contributions of the Institute of Internal Auditors as they celebrate their 75th anniversary. I wish them continued success moving forward as they mold the next generation of internal auditors.

BECK JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
CELEBRATES 20 YEARS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Beck Junior High School of the Katy Independent School District for celebrating their 20th anniversary since the school opened its doors.

Beck Junior High School has been educating students from the Katy Independent School District for twenty years now. The school credits its family-like atmosphere and mentality to the success of both the students and overall school atmosphere. Eight current faculty members also attended the school as students.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Beck Junior High School for providing a quality education for Katy students for twenty years. We thank the school for providing an environment that both teaches and inspires students. We wish Beck Junior High School success in educating our students for generations to come.

HONORING JAYLIN RODGERS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Cadet COL Jaylin Rodgers of Lanier High School who was named the 2016 Jackson Public Schools Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps Cadet of the Year.

Cadet COL Rodgers serves as the Battalion Commander for Lanier's 1st Battalion Mighty Bulldogs. He holds a 3.33 GPA and has earned a score of 25 on the ACT. He has taken advanced level courses throughout high school, such as Accelerated English I and II, Accelerated Geometry, and Advanced Placement U.S. History.

A member of the school's National Honor Society, Cadet COL Rodgers is also the recipient of JROTC's Scholastic Excellence Award and was a Leadership Education and Training, Level One top cadet.

Cadet COL Rodgers served on Lanier High School's Battalion staff for three years as the Human Resources Officer, Executive Officer, and now the Battalion Commander. Cadet Rodgers has attended the LeaderSTATE Leadership and STEM Camp and Boys State at Mississippi State University and the Junior Cadet Leadership Challenge at Fort Knox, Kentucky. His plans are to attend Jackson State University, major in Electrical Engineering, and attain a commission into the Army as a second lieutenant.

Cadet COL Rodgers is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Larry and Tamarrus Rodgers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Cadet COL Jaylin Rodgers.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

SPEECH OF

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 2016

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment and I thank my colleague, Representative SEWELL, for standing up for consumers.

Time and time again, we hear about hard-working families being exploited by predatory, small-dollar, short-term lenders, such as payday lenders. While these loans are meant to help underserved individuals in need of quick cash, far too many times the borrower ends up trapped in a vicious cycle of rollovers, fees and more debt.

We sell our families short when we accept that high-interest loans are the best we can do for our communities. Payday and auto title loans, with uncapped annual percentage rates, have long enticed families in moments of desperation—offering short-term fast cash at the cost of long-term debt—at rates averaging 500 percent APR.

In my home state of Texas, an average \$500 payday loan costs an astounding \$1,100 or more to repay in a period of just a few months. Moreover, in Texas, payday and auto title lending is a \$5.8 billion industry with over 70 percent of the volume from refinances and fees. In fact, four of every five payday loans are rolled over or renewed within 14 days with the majority of those costing the consumer more in fees than they borrowed, according to a CFPB study.

Thankfully, the CFPB has taken the lead in proposing to rein in these predatory and harmful loans. We should be fighting to eliminate excessively high-interest rates and debt-trap cycles that define much of today's payday and auto title loan lending landscape, rather than fighting against the CFPB's efforts.

Unfortunately, this financial services and general government appropriations bill enshrines the status-quo of debt-traps and mountains of fees for consumers without any protections afforded by the CFPB's proposed rule.

I applaud the CFPB's rulemaking efforts in this area, and I hope it ushers in a new era of responsible lending.

TRIBUTE TO LEISURE WORLD OF MARYLAND

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Leisure World of Maryland's 50th anniversary.

Leisure World was founded in 1966 by Ross Cortese, who observed that the population of

older citizens was growing and thought that their special needs were not being met. His vision was "gracious, carefree, secure living for adults in a self-contained community that provides all the facilities but none of the drudgery of home ownership." His innovative dream created self-contained senior communities, offering rewarding living for older people still interested in leading active and enriched lives.

The first residents of Leisure World of Maryland moved into their new "manors" in August 1966. The available housing options at the time were townhouses called "Berkeleys" and one-story duplexes called "Carvels" near the first Clubhouse and across the street from the 18th hole of the golf course. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, Cortese continued developing single family homes, townhomes and duplexes, along with the community's golf course, administrative facilities and medical center, and investing in the community's physical and social infrastructure.

Over the years, Leisure World continued to expand and provide seniors with additional housing options and facilities. In 1980, Cortese teamed up with renowned Watergate developer Giuseppe Cecchi and his company, The IDI Group Companies, to complete the development of the community. IDI reconfigured the site plan in a way that increased density through luxury multifamily condominium structures while preserving parkland, improving the golf course, and adding a second community clubhouse. The final condominium units were completed in 2013.

Today, Leisure World of Maryland continues to be a model for active living. Home to more than 8000 residents aged 55+ and including three voting precincts, Leisure World offers its residents a wide variety of services and amenities, including restaurants, clubhouses, a medical center, an interfaith chapel and an 18-hole golf course. Residents participate in an extensive program of fitness classes, lectures, concerts, trips, and nearly 100 clubs and organizations. Miles of walking trails lead through a beautiful blend of pristine landscapes and natural settings.

Leisure World is a rare gem in Montgomery County and in the State of Maryland. Its residents enjoy an outstanding quality of life and are active and engaged members of both the Leisure World community and the greater community outside its gates. I urge my colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations to Leisure World of Maryland as it celebrates its 50th anniversary and our gratitude and appreciation for its residents' contributions to our community.

HONORING MR. FLOYD HASTINGS,
2016 MYRA H. KRAFT COMMUNITY
MVP AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the accomplishments of one of my constituents, Floyd Hastings, who has spent countless hours volunteering with the Southern Maine Agency on Aging's Vet to Vet program.

Mr. Hastings has received a Myra H. Kraft Community MVP Award from the New England Patriots Charitable Foundation for his

work with Vet to Vet, along with a check for \$10,000 for the program. Hastings was one of 26 MVP recipients; a record number of 450 volunteers throughout New England were nominated for the awards this year.

Vet to Vet volunteers, who are all veterans themselves, visit aging or disabled veterans in their homes at least twice a month. The volunteers provide companionship to the veterans they visit and often become close friends. Hastings has worked specifically with three veterans and currently spends several hours each week talking with a group of veterans at the Sam L. Cohen Center in Biddeford.

"Vet to Vet is one of the best things I have ever been involved in," Hastings said. "It is rewarding and helps give meaning to my life. The program enables veteran volunteers, like myself, to enrich the lives of veterans, often severely disabled, in their final days. My visits are the highlight of my week, and I have found this to be true for the veterans I visit."

Mr. Speaker, I truly admire Mr. Hastings for his incredible service and dedication, and would like to thank him wholeheartedly for the difference he has made in the lives of Maine veterans.

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR BRENTON
WEECE

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Major Brenton Weece of the United States Army for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to our Nation. Major Weece will soon transition from his current assignment as an Army Congressional Liaison in the House of Representatives to serve as an officer in the Oklahoma National Guard.

A native of Miami, Oklahoma, Brent was commissioned through the Oklahoma State University Army ROTC Program in 2005 and subsequently assigned to the Oklahoma National Guard. Since then, Brent has served in multiple staff and leadership positions in the Oklahoma National Guard, including two deployments with Oklahoma's 45th Infantry Brigade Combat Team. In 2008, he deployed to Iraq as the aide-de-camp to the commander of the Joint Area Support Group—Central in Baghdad and in 2011 and 2012, he commanded an infantry company in eastern Afghanistan.

During the course of Major Weece's service to this Nation, he has earned awards and decorations including: the Bronze Star Medal, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Air Assault Badge, Pathfinder Badge, Combat Action Badge, and Combat Infantryman Badge.

In 2015, Brent was selected to serve as a Congressional Liaison in the US Army House Liaison Division. Army Congressional Liaison Officers provide Members and staff insight and understanding of Army policies, actions, operations, and requirements. Their first-hand knowledge of military needs, culture, and tradition is a tremendous benefit to Congressional offices. His service in the House of Representatives has proven invaluable to both the Department of Defense and Congress. Brent was

especially effective in his service to Members and staff as he escorted them on fact-finding missions to multiple countries in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to work with Major Weece during his time as an Army Congressional Liaison Officer in the House of Representatives. On behalf of a grateful Nation, it is my honor to recognize the selfless service and sacrifice of Major Brenton Weece, his wife, Emily, and their children Lily and Graham. I wish them the very best as they continue to dedicate their lives to the service of our Nation.

DR. VERA WEHRING RETIRES
FROM B.F. TERRY HIGH SCHOOL

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Vera Wehring on her retirement from B.F. Terry High School in Rosenberg, Texas, after serving 22 years.

During Dr. Wehring's time at Terry High School she inspired students first as a math teacher and assistant principal, then later as principal of the high school. Some of Dr. Wehring's greatest accomplishments include being named as a Breakthrough School and when she was invited to participate in the National Principals Association in Cuba. The students of Terry High School have been well served by her leadership in helping ensure a strong education for our students.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations and thank you to Dr. Vera Wehring for her 22 years of service to Rosenberg and the entire Lamar Consolidated Independent School District. We appreciate her service and dedication.

HONORING MR. JAMES MALLET

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a community servant, Mr. James Mallett. Mr. Mallett has shown what can be done through tenacity, dedication and a desire to serve his community.

James Mallett was born in the Carter community to Edward and Ethel Mallett. James' family lived on a plantation called Clark and Cato. He grew up in a small church called Mt. Salem. He learned many life lessons from working on the family farm.

James graduated from Yazoo City High School in 1983. James attended Jackson State University, but returned home to take a job with Yazoo Industries, where he remained for ten years.

In 1990 Chief BJ Wright offered James a job at the Yazoo City Fire Department. Through the years, James also had the opportunity to work under Charles Moore, Mike Woodard, Roy Wilson and Terry Harber.

James credits his wife, Alma, for supporting him as he worked for the Yazoo City Fire Department for 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. James Mallett for his dedication and loyalty to Yazoo City.

TRIBUTE TO ALICE AND RICHARD
OSBORN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Alice and Richard Osborn of Clarinda, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on May 28, 2016.

Alice and Richard's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, I hope it is filled with happy memories. May their commitment grow even stronger as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

I salute this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CSU-PUEBLO

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Colorado State University—Pueblo for its recent designation as a National Center of Academic Excellence in Cyber Defense by the National Security Agency. CSU—Pueblo will hold this honor for the next five years.

Technological advancement has made the modern American economy possible, and we all rely on technology to succeed in today's world. Equally important is ensuring we maintain the technical ability to protect the systems that support the technology we interface with every day, and providing that protection has become more and more challenging. The NSA partners with institutions of higher learning to help research and promote cyber security and defense education to help meet the ever rising demand qualified candidates in the cyber security field.

The National Science Foundation gives students the opportunity to earn scholarships and grants through Centers for Academic Excellence while pursuing a greater education in cyber defense. This CAE designation is very important for the university and its students in Pueblo and the surrounding areas who wish to pursue a career within cyber security.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work that CSU—Pueblo faculty has done to achieve this prestigious designation. The students enrolled in the program will be receiving the highest quality education in the field. Congratulations to CSU—Pueblo for this accomplishment. I am proud to honor the staff and students that make the university great.

IN TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT MICHAEL SMITH OF THE DALLAS POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I rise today to pay tribute to Sergeant Michael Smith of the Dallas Police Department. Sgt. Smith, along with his fellow police officers: Lorne Aherns, Michael Krol, Brent Thompson, and Patrick Zamarripa died in the tragic police ambush in Dallas, Texas, last week. All of these officers were serving to help facilitate the First Amendment rights of all citizens to freely assemble and express their views. When shots rang out in downtown Dallas on the evening of July 7th and the early morning of July 8th, these officers ran towards the danger and harm's way to keep the citizens safe that they are sworn to protect.

A resident of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, Sgt. Smith lived in Carrollton and was a veteran supervisor officer of the Dallas Police Department (DPD), having joined the force in 1989. Prior to his service as a police officer, Sgt. Smith served all of us by wearing a different uniform—the uniform of an Army Ranger. In both his military and police service, Michael Smith was among the very best of public servants.

Service in uniform was only one of the ways that Michael Smith gave back to the community. He was an active volunteer member for his church, Watermark Community Church, and the YMCA. His lasting legacy will be found in the hearts of the many people whom he touched, served, and protected.

He is survived by his wife Heidi, a teacher at Mary Immaculate Catholic School and a former city employee for Farmers Branch, Texas, and two daughters, Victoria and Caroline.

I ask that all of my colleagues, and the entire nation, honor the life of Sgt. Michael Smith and keep the Smith family in their thoughts and prayers.

ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH
PIOPOLIS

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the celebration of the 175th Anniversary of St. John the Baptist Parish in Piopolis, IL.

St. John the Baptist church was established in 1841. The parish operated a school from 1870 through 1964. Precious Blood Sisters came from Burwell, Germany, to teach at the school. Nine sisters arrived on February 28th, 1870. There were Precious Blood Sisters teaching in Piopolis until the school closed in 1964.

The parish is in a farming community; their membership is comprised of 184 families. Because of the strength and character of its members, the parish possesses both a rich history and a vibrant future. They are commemorating their 175th anniversary with a

special mass with festivities to follow on August 21st, 2016. I am honored to recognize such a strong faith community in my district.

I look forward to the continued prosperity of St. John the Baptist Parish in Piopolis for many years to come.

PRESIDENT ERDOGAN'S ASSAULT
ON THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE
TURKISH PEOPLE

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind our government that the human rights abuses committed by Turkish President Erdogan are grave and ongoing, and to distinguish between the Turkish president and the Turkish people—and to stand with the people.

President Recep Tayyip Erdogan has in recent years been aggressively violating the human rights of Turkish citizens and undermining the rule of law, in order to root out dissent and consolidate his personal power. The freedom of the press and the rights of common citizens to run schools, businesses, and volunteer associations have come under direct threat.

Since assuming the presidency two years ago, President Erdogan has undermined the independence of the judiciary, jeopardizing access to a fair trial and undercutting government accountability. In 2014, he worked to stack the country's High Council of Judges and Prosecutors with party loyalists, enabling his government to ease arrest procedures and curtail opportunities for appeal. This facilitated the detention of thousands of activists, journalists, and businessmen under the country's overbroad terrorism statute. The President has exploited his growing leverage over the courts: his government's reshuffling last month of 3,700 judges and prosecutors rewarded pliant members of the judiciary while punishing others who ruled against the government or heard cases involving official corruption. A law passed earlier this month dismissed most of the judges on Turkey's highest courts, leaving it up to the High Council of Judges and Prosecutors to reappoint them or pick their successors.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to undermining government institutions, President Erdogan's tightening grip on Turkey is also weakening the vitality of Turkish society. Under President Erdogan's direction, state authorities are undertaking a campaign of retribution against Erdogan's critics. Since Erdogan assumed the presidency in 2014, the government has opened nearly 2,000 cases against people suspected of "insulting the president"—a crime in Turkey.

Professional journalists and major news outlets in particular have incurred the wrath of the President. For reporting that is unflattering to Erdogan, whether on national security issues, the conflict with the Kurds, or official corruption, press outlets have been charged with "supporting terrorism" or have had their entire operations taken over by government-appointed trustees. In one of the most egregious examples, Turkish authorities in March raided the offices of the nation's highest-circulation newspaper, Zaman, and overnight placed it

under hand-picked, progovernment management.

Mr. Speaker, President Erdogan has taken to politicizing the charge of "supporting terrorism"—undermining the serious business of fighting terrorism, one of the gravest threats faced by the Turkish people. One persistent critic of Erdogan's centralization agenda and authoritarian tendencies is Fethullah Gulen, the founder of Hizmet, a moderate, Islamic civic movement dedicated to promoting education, popular piety, and civic engagement. Because of this criticism, Hizmet and its followers have suffered wave after wave of unfounded terrorism charges and forcible government seizures of businesses, universities, and schools. In May, the Turkish Cabinet approved a decision to designate Hizmet a "terrorist organization," guaranteeing that this campaign of political retribution will continue. Gulen's followers have been placed in the crosshairs of the very arbitrary policies they criticize. Yet neither our State Department, nor the European Union, nor any other respected body outside Turkey, has ever characterized Hizmet as a terrorist group or anything like it—the Cabinet's designation is absurd.

Mr. Speaker, in recent months, the Turkish people have been struck by a wave of violent attacks perpetrated by Islamist and Kurdish terrorists—most recently, a triple-suicide attack at Istanbul's international airport by Islamist extremists killed 44 innocent civilians. Our thoughts and prayers go out to all those maimed in these attacks, to all those who lost beloved family and friends.

I am confident that the Turkish people—for centuries renowned for their bravery—will never be cowed by terrorists, and that they will equally resist President Erdogan's attempt to undermine their rights, laws, and freedoms. Our government should stand with the Turkish people on both fronts.

HONORING WILLIE "SATELLITE"
TOTTEN

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Willie Totten, who is a former professional football player and current college football coach. Totten played his high school football at J.Z. George High School in North Carrollton, Mississippi. Totten was a four-year starter quarterback at Mississippi Valley State University from 1981 to 1985, along with Jerry Rice as his target as wide receiver. Totten set more than 50 Division I-AA passing records, and Rice setting many Division I-AA receiving records.

The Delta Devils averaged 59 points a game during the 1984 season, with Totten throwing for a record 58 touchdowns and leading the Delta Devils to the Division I-AA playoffs in 1984. Archie Cooley, who was the head coach at MVSU from 1980 to 1986, was the architect of the pass-oriented offense that utilized the skills of Totten.

Totten played professionally in the Canadian Football League (CFL) with the BC Lions (and Toronto Argonauts before moving on to the National Football League (NFL), as a replacement player for the Buffalo Bills during the

strike-shortened 1987 NFL season. Totten played in the Arena Football League for the Chicago Bruisers, Pittsburgh Gladiators and the New Orleans Night.

Totten earned his master's degree at Grambling State University, and was a graduate assistant on the coaching staff for head football coach Eddie Robinson. Totten returned to his alma mater and served as quarterbacks coach and running back coach during the 1990s before moving on to coach at the high school level for two years. He returned to the MVSU coaching staff in 2000, and was elevated to head coach in 2001. Totten brought pride back to Mississippi Valley State, as he led the Delta Devils to back-to-back winning seasons in 2005 and 2006. Totten resigned after the 2009 season, and took an administrative position at MVSU in 2010. In 2013, Totten became quarterbacks coach at Albany State University in Albany, Georgia for one season before accepting the quarterback coaching position at Alabama A&M University under new head football coach James Spady.

Totten is one of a few college football coaches ever to coach in a stadium named after him. The Delta Devils football team plays in Rice-Totten Field, named for Totten and wide receiver Jerry Rice. He is a member of the College Football Hall of Fame. Totten is a member of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Willie "Satellite" Totten, a professor football player and educator, for his dedication to serving others and giving back to the African American community.

STAFFORD ELEMENTARY'S MS. CAROLINA SIEVERS IS NAMED 2015-2016 STAFFORD SCHOOL DISTRICT TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Stafford Elementary teacher Carolina Sievers for being named Stafford Municipal School District Teacher of the year.

Each year Stafford MSD recognizes a teacher with this honor as a reflection of his or her outstanding work and dedication to the students and the entire Stafford school community. Carolina's dedication to her students made her this year's recipient. She is the Bilingual Math, Science, and Technology teacher for Stafford Elementary. She has a Master's degree in Engineering Management from The Catholic University of America and previously taught at two Houston area colleges before becoming an elementary school teacher. She is known for her passion for teaching and instilling reasoning skills in her students that will be valuable to them for life. Stafford students are well served by her dedication to education.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Ms. Seivers for being named Teacher of the Year by the Stafford Municipal School District. We thank her for all that she does for our community and the students at Stafford Elementary.

TRIBUTE TO JIM SORENSEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mr. Jim Sorensen of Council Bluffs, Iowa, for his volunteer services at The Center in Council Bluffs. Jim spends many mornings assisting members of The Center, which is a senior and adult facility focused on health and wellness.

Jim was born in Guthrie Center, Iowa in 1942. He graduated from Audubon High School in 1961 and began his career in the auto mechanic industry from which he retired in 2005. Jim and his wife, JoAnn, have been married 54 years and are the parents of two children, Robert and Kimberly, and they have three grandchildren.

Jim became a member of The Center about 10 years ago and started to volunteer his services at the facility. He enjoys helping with the welcome desk, assists with the annual health fair, and helps operate bingo games for the many patrons. Jim said that once he joined The Center, he started volunteering because there were a lot of people who needed help. Jim has been active in the community as a Cub Scout leader and he was a youth group leader at Our Savior's Lutheran Church. Jim's trademark is that he always wears a smile and has never met a stranger.

I commend Jim Sorensen for the dedicated service he has provided to The Center and his community. I know my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating Jim for his many years of community service. I wish Jim and his family the very best in the future.

MARKING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROANOKER RESTAURANT—A LOCAL TREASURE

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, good food at good prices—that's The Roanoker Restaurant's tradition. The Roanoker Restaurant, which opened its doors on July 1, 1941, is a local treasure in the Roanoke Valley. I am honored to recognize owner Butch Craft, and her team, as they mark 75 years of operation.

Regardless of whether you've been going for decades or just trying it for the first time, when you sit down for a meal at The Roanoker, you know you've found the real deal. From homemade biscuits that you won't soon forget or the comfort food that reminds you of your childhood, The Roanoker does not disappoint. I've enjoyed many a good meal there with my family.

Started in 1941 by Crafton Warren and later passed down to his son, E.C., The Roanoker Restaurant has continued to expand under the current owner, Butch Craft, now employing 75 people with room to seat 300 diners. Over the past 75 years, The Roanoker Restaurant has operated in five locations. But despite changes in address, The Roanoker's tradition of good food at good prices has remained steadfast.

Part of the restaurant's success is owed to the loyal staff, including many who have worked there for over 10, 20, even 30 years.

The Roanoker is locally owned and operated, making this restaurant a true cornerstone of the Roanoke community. Church and civic groups, family reunions, and business meetings all find a spot at the table. It is a meeting place for generations to come together. The Roanoker Restaurant also has a rich history of supporting various groups in the community, including its longtime sponsorship of The Roanokers, a Major League Division team in Cave Spring National Little League.

It is an honor to represent the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia, and businesses like The Roanoker Restaurant. Thank you for your continued presence in our community, and for bringing good food at good prices to generations of Roanokers. I wish you many more years of success. Congratulations to The Roanoker Restaurant on this 75th anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that I inadvertently voted "Yea" on Roll Call 403. I intended to vote "Nay".

HONORING THE LIFE OF AMANDA ALVEAR

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Amanda Alvear, a resident of my district who lived in Davenport, Florida. Amanda's life was cut short during the tragic shooting at Pulse nightclub in Orlando, in the early morning hours of June 12, 2016.

Amanda was only 25 years old and had a bright future ahead of her. She was a graduate of Ridge Community High School and worked as a pharmacy technician. She was studying to become a nurse. She had reshaped herself over the last two years, shedding 180 pounds with the help of gastric bypass surgery and daily workouts. Amanda proudly documented her transformation with her phone.

Amanda's brother, Brian, remembers her positive energy and enthusiasm and that, "People got caught up in her wake. Whatever she was doing, that's what they were going to do." Amanda was the aunt who spoiled Brian's daughters, Bella and Zatanna with clothes. "She was a fashionista," he would say, "and she liked them to look good. She wanted my girls—her girls—to look good."

Amanda frequented gay and lesbian clubs because she believed they were places where she could have fun and feel safe being herself. She visited Pulse to enjoy Latin night with a group of friends. One of her closest friends, Mercedes Marisol Flores, also died in the nightclub that night.

Amanda Alvear will never be forgotten in our pursuit of a more just and loving world.

Her memory, the love she had for family and her acts kindness will live forever in the hearts and minds of those who knew her.

May Amanda's family, relatives and friends eventually find solace and comfort, and may she rest in eternal peace.

PAYING TRIBUTE FOR WILLIAM
"BILL" COORS

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th Birthday of Bill Coors. A resident of Golden, Colorado, he will be celebrating this momentous birthday on August 11, 2016. Bill is the grandson of Adolf Coors, the founder of Coors Brewing Company, a major pioneer in the beverage distribution business.

After graduating with a Master's Degree in chemical engineering from Princeton University in 1939, Bill began his career in the family business. Over the course of 64 years he worked his way up the business ranks, starting as a chemical engineer and eventually earning the title of president of the company. Bill retired from Coors in 2003, at the tender age of 87. When Bill first started with Coors, the company was a mere regional operation. Today, Coors beer is a recognized brand throughout the world. This fact serves as a testament to Bill's determination and hard work.

His management of the Coors Brewing Company had a tremendous impact on the Third Congressional District of Colorado, and it continues to provide jobs in all parts of the production process, from the earliest stages in the barley fields to the delivery trucks that carry Coors products to their final destinations.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Coors' life has been full of incredible accomplishments. As a brewery pioneer, a successful manager for his family's company, and as a lifelong Coloradoan, Bill is truly an inspiration for all. It is an honor to pay tribute to Bill's life and legacy, and I wish him a very happy 100th birthday this year.

TRIBUTE TO LAURIE AND GENE
JOHNSON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Laurie and Gene Johnson of Shenandoah, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on June 11, 2016.

Laurie and Gene's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, I hope it is filled with happy memories. May their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

I salute this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Laurie and Gene on this momentous occasion.

HONORING WANDERERS HOME
MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Wanderers Home Missionary Baptist Church, a remarkable house of worship in Mound Bayou, Mississippi.

The Wanderers Home Missionary Baptist Church has a rich history, which is a legend within itself. At the turn of the twentieth century, a group of Christian leaders and laymen, some early settlers and others who migrated to the town of Mound Bayou, were led by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit to come together to organize a church in the year of 1908. Some had acquired land and others sharecropped farms outside of the town limit. There was no church in the near vicinity of their homes, and means of transportation was limited. There had been a yearning for a place to meet and worship, to fellowship and to praise and give thanks unto the Almighty God for His goodness. Coming together in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Wash and Kerri Mosley who were early settlers, led to fruitful discussions and plans to lay the foundation for what was to become their own place of worship, the Wanderers Home Missionary Baptist Church located 2½ miles east of the town of Mound Bayou, MS.

Initially, the church was located on the north side of Township Road, but later relocated to the south side of the road where they purchased land and built a church. The land was sold and later, rebuilt back on the north side, its present location.

The late Reverend W.M. Wilson was named the first pastor and began with a small group of faithful members under the most humble circumstances and with lots of faith in God. As the town of Mound Bayou became a major tourist attraction, with the growing population and industrial development, the membership at Wanderers Home grew rapidly.

The pulpit has been graced with some of the most remarkable preachers and ministers. The late Reverend Thornton, Reverend H.H. Humes, Reverend W.M. Stampley, Reverend W.M. Walden, Reverend Richardson, Reverend Zack Pittman, Reverend T.F. Hammond, Reverend C.H. Moreland, (who served as pastor for twenty-six years), Reverend Andrew Hawkins and Reverend Willie J. Jackson (the current pastor), was called as the leader of the congregation in 1991.

Under the leadership of Pastor Moreland, a fellowship hall was added to the church as the need for a place to extend their fellowship beyond the sanctuary. Under the leadership of Pastor Jackson, many accomplishments have taken place: Wanderers Home became the first church in Mound Bayou to have full-time worship services; incorporated 4th Sunday Broadcast Worship Service; started weekly bible class for adults and youths; and organized and increased Youth ministry activities.

The sanctuary was renovated with stained glass windows and new pews. Due to growth in membership the church purchased a van to transport elderly and youth parishioners.

Over the years, the church has reached beyond its walls to support the community, families, other communities throughout Bolivar and

surrounding counties through its Missionary Ministry, as well as its Youth and Adult ministries.

Wanderers Home supported and has been actively involved as a member of the Bolivar County Baptist Association since its organization, as well as a member of the State and National Congress of Christian Education. Many of its members have and continue to serve in leadership roles as leaders, teachers, and auxiliary heads in the organization.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Wanderers Home Missionary Baptist Church for their spiritual enhancements in Mound Bayou, the surrounding communities and the State of Mississippi.

HONORING THE WORLD WAR II
AND KOREAN WAR VETERANS
OF ILLINOIS

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the World War II and Korean War veterans who traveled to Washington, D.C. on July 13, 2016 with Honor Flight Chicago, a program that provides World War II and Korean War veterans the opportunity to visit their memorials on The National Mall in Washington, D.C. These memorials were built to honor their courage and service to their country.

The American Veteran is one of our greatest treasures. The Soldiers, Airmen, Sailors, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen who traveled here on July 13th answered our nation's call to service during one of its greatest times of need. From the European Campaign to the Pacific Asian Theatre to the African Theatre, these brave Americans risked life and limb, gave service and sacrificed much, all while embodying what it is to be a hero. We owe them more gratitude than can ever be expressed.

I welcome these brave veterans to Washington and to their memorials. I am proud to submit the names of these men and women for all to see, hear, and recognize, and I call on my colleagues to rise and join me in expressing gratitude.

Lido A. Andreoni, Martin J. Baureis, Eugene J. Beausoleil, Joseph A. Brochman, William J. Brown, Howard L. Bruning, Carmen L. Caputo, Frank A. Carbonaro, LeRoy L. Carlson, Louis A. Champa, Gerald Connerty, Jeremiah Coughlin, Walter J. Crane, Domenico D'Alessandro, Fred Nelson Day, Leonard Henry DeMichele, Raymond Devlin, Dominic L. Disandro, Christo M. Dragatsis, George J. Drobney, Russell W. Duller, August J. Edelman, Arthur R. Edelstein, Charles Nathan Elias, Edward E. Fioretti, Frank Flores, Donald L. Forrest, Robert L. Foster, Earl S. Fowlkes, Ernest G. Frantz, Marvin G. Freeman, Harry Freudenheim, Nick Gallo, Donavon D. Gibson, James E. Gryczka, Jerome Lewis Handler, Leonard M. Hansen, Richard Harwood, Clarence R. Hutchison, Robert W. Hynes, Ralph J. Imbrogno, George H. Kallas, Joseph G. Kaplan, Allan L. Kaplan, James R. Keith, Roger J. King, Gerald S. Kramer, Richard Kraska, George L. Kucharchuk, Eugene M. Kukla, Ralph M. Lacy, John R. Lahaie, George J. Lamoureux, Myrtle L. Larrison, James R. Lass, Robert R. Lovati, Francis

H. Lucht, Fred J. Mancari, Charles E. Manis, Francisco Matos, Alfred J. McAndrew, Robert L. Menclawicz, James A. Mervin, Elwood H. Michel, Neil P. Moore, Frederick J. Mundt, Glen E. Myers, James L. O'Brien, Sheldon R. Olsen Jr., Donald P. O'Neil, Lester D. Pauls, Donald P. Perille, Earl N. Pilgrim, Steve J. Pizzello, Walter R. Pollak, William D. Powell, Richard R. Pucin, Herbert G. Richards, Frederick J. Richter, Jonathan N. Rivers, Philip E. Robinson, Stanley D. Russell Jr., Leno Santacaterina, George Martin Schallmo Jr., Joseph Schmieder, Delbert L. Schoenbeck, Bernard H. Shedor, David S. Silverman, Robert L. Sinclair, Sheldon Sonheim, Thomas J. Stacks, Walter E. Stankiewicz, Lawrence J. Steskal, Frederick A. Stevens, Morton Stillman, Donald Stillman, Robert R. Straits, Robert J. Sutphen, George R. Thompson, William G. Vejvoda, Ronald E. Vezina, Gerald L. Wien, George A. Wilkins, William C. Witte, George A. Wolters, Robert O. Yahn, Richard K. Yohnka.

IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF MARY FRITZ

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in sadness to honor and remember a lifelong friend and colleague, former Connecticut State Representative, Mary Fritz, who honorably served constituents in Cheshire and Wallingford for an impressive thirty-two years and who passed away last week. Mary dedicated her life to serving the people of the 90th district, and will forever be remembered for her fighting spirit and genuine care for constituents. Her strong sense of morality guided her work in the legislature and marked her as a truly exceptional representative.

Before her tenure in the Connecticut General Assembly, Mary studied at Emmanuel College, Boston College, Trinity College, and Fairfield University. She later expanded her role in Connecticut school systems, serving as a Wallingford Public School teacher, the president of the Yalesville School PTA, and ultimately, the Chairwoman of the Wallingford Board of Education. She was an outstanding model for the value of education—a sentiment that translated to her work in the legislature, as she prioritized education policy. Mary also spent years forging the way for new legislation to battle crime and advance health care in Connecticut, while also paying special attention to protecting and serving senior citizens.

I couldn't agree more with Governor Malloy's recent statement, "She was a true public servant who put the priorities of her constituents first and represented her district with distinction." From 1987 to 1994 I represented the citizens of Vernon, Connecticut at the General Assembly alongside Mary. For two years we sat side by side in the House chambers and I enjoyed every minute of her steady commentary on the bills we were working on, the speeches we listened to, and the people who paraded by our seats on the back benches. She had a biting wit and shrewd mind that sized up every bit of action going on—even into the late hours. During those long sessions she brought her quilting with

her, and one time I voted a way she didn't like, she poked me with her quilting needle—with a big devilish grin on her face.

She was focused on two things as a person and a public official. First, representing the voters who elected her. Winning a swing seat sixteen times shows how successfully she accomplished that mission. And second, she was truly devoted to her family—her husband, William, and their children who are all special and successful in their own right.

The positive footprint of Mary's work will be gratefully remembered for years to come. I trust that her legacy will live on through the work of loving family—her husband, six children, and fourteen grandchildren. Her presence and spirit will be greatly missed both in and out of the legislature. I now ask that my colleagues please join me in remembering Mary's full and altruistic life, and in offering our sincere condolences to her friends and family.

TRIBUTE TO SHELLEY KESSLER UPON HER RETIREMENT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Shelley Kessler, a pillar of the California Labor Movement, as she retires from serving the people of San Mateo County with great distinction and respect, as Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the San Mateo County Central Labor Council.

Shelley Kessler has said that she became involved in the labor movement because social and economic justice struggles are the basis of her life and work. She grew up in Los Angeles, graduated from Sonoma State University and began working rotating shifts at Owens Illinois. Her union career expanded in 1977 at General Motors where she became the first woman elected as a full-time Union Representative of the local UAW. She began her 34 year affiliation with the IAM in 1982 when she began work at Westinghouse Electric. In 1985 Shelley applied for the job of Political Director of the San Mateo County Central Labor Council, a position she held for eleven years. For the past twenty years she has been Executive Director-Treasurer of the Labor Council where she represented 110 affiliated local unions and 70,000 working member families.

On her appointment in 2014 to the California Commission on Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation, IAM International President Tom Buffenbarger said "Kessler's unyielding dedication to the working families of California and her community is exemplary. The CHSWC is fortunate to have such a proud advocate for workers' health and safety as a member of its board. "Shelley Kessler's advocacy has been a force for good. She positioned labor as a force in San Mateo County and has been a leader in many organizing efforts. She has served on countless boards and committees to advance workers and unions, and has earned many accolades including the California Labor Federation "Women Labor Leader of the Year" award, and was inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame in recognition of "Extraordinary Achievements and Contributions."

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring a great American woman, pioneer, role model, union leader and workers' advocate, Shelley Kessler, as she retires from the San Mateo County Central Labor Council. We are a stronger nation because she has worked for all of us and we wish her every blessing in her well-deserved retirement.

PRESIDENT OF THE VERMONT RETAIL AND GROCERS ASSOCIATION TO RETIRE

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Jim Harrison for his tireless work over nearly three decades on behalf of Vermont's retailers and grocers. After 29 years, Jim will retire at the end of this year from his position as President of the Vermont Retail and Grocers Association and its predecessor organization, the Vermont Grocers Association.

In Vermont, the local grocery or general store is the heart of our small communities. It's a place where locals gather for much more than milk, meat, and produce. Indeed, these small businesses are woven into the fabric of our communities. Each and every one of them has benefitted from Jim's passion and perseverance.

As President Pro Tem of the Vermont Senate and now as a Member of Congress, I have worked closely with Jim over the years. He has been a respected leader in shaping public policy throughout his tenure. He is a tireless and tenacious advocate who, without fail, accomplished his goals in a bipartisan and cooperative manner. He commanded the respect of governors and legislators, and allies and opponents, because he has always been a man of high integrity who cares deeply about the issues that impact the retail industry.

Jim's first job as a teenager was bagging groceries at Landoli's Market in Westborough, Mass. The retail touch he learned in that job served him well over the years in Montpelier and is appreciated by the many businesses he has represented.

He studied business at Nichols College before transferring to Cornell University to study food marketing. After graduating he landed a position in Hannaford Brothers' training program and went on to manage its stores in Rutland and South Burlington. After a stint in Boston, he returned to Vermont in 1987 to head the Vermont Grocers Association, which merged with the Vermont Retail Association in 2013.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Jim's leadership, advice, and friendship over the past three decades. He will be missed, but I have no doubt that his wise counsel will always be available as needed.

I ask the United States House of Representatives to join me and all Vermonters in wishing Jim and his wife, Pat, the best in retirement.

DEBRA HANEY ELECTED ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF GALVESTON-HOUSTON

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Debra Haney of Sugar Land, TX for being elected to serve as Associate Superintendent of the Archdiocese of Galveston-Houston.

Debra Haney has served as the beloved principal of St. Laurence Catholic School for ten years. Prior to serving St. Laurence Catholic School, Haney was the Principal of John Paul II Catholic School for six years. She has more than twenty three years of Catholic educational experience. Under Debra Haney's guidance, St. Laurence Catholic School has expanded and thrived, adding specialized teachers, new opportunities to participate in the arts and sports, and greater access to new educational technology. Thanks to her leadership, St. Laurence Catholic School has flourished while retaining a focus on spiritual growth and Catholic identity. As the new Associate Superintendent, Debra Haney will reach even more new students in the Galveston-Houston Archdiocese.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Debra Haney for being named the new Associate Superintendent of the Archdiocese of Galveston-Houston. We also thank her for her years of dedicated service to Sugar Land Catholic students.

TRIBUTE TO SANDY HINSLEY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate Sandy Hinsley of Council Bluffs, Iowa, for her volunteer services at The Center in Council Bluffs. Sandy spends many mornings assisting members at The Center. The Center is a senior and adult facility focused on health and wellness.

Sandy is originally from Omaha, Nebraska and moved to Council Bluffs in 1997. She worked many years at the Nestle Company in Omaha and retired in 2002. Sandy and her late husband, Jack, were blessed with four daughters, 14 grandchildren, and five great-grandchildren. Sandy Hinsley can be found assisting Center members at the welcome desk, helping with the ballroom dancing class, and serving as a senior ambassador. She enjoys gardening, adult coloring books, and taking walks with her daughters. Sandy said she loves to volunteer at The Center because she says, "Everyone is so nice."

I commend Sandy Hinsley for the dedicated service she provides to The Center and her community. I know my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating Sandy for her many years of service to The Center. I wish Sandy and her family the very best in the future.

HONORING ADJUTANT MAJOR GENERAL AUGUSTUS L. COLLINS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jackson, Mississippi native, Major General Augustus L. Collins, Adjutant General of Mississippi, who also serves as the commanding General of both the Mississippi Army and Air National Guard.

After 35 years of being active in the Mississippi Army National Guard, Major General Collins announced his retirement, concluding his service at the end of August. His passion for service began when he was invited to attend a National Guard drill, and saw the position as an opportunity to earn extra income. He enlisted in the Mississippi Army National Guard's company B, 1st Battalion 198th Armor Regiment in March 1977, and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant July 1980.

After enlisting, General Collins attended the University of Mississippi where he received his Bachelor of Business Administration. Afterwards, he received a Master Business Administration degree from Jackson State University. He also earned a Master of Strategic Studies degree from the United States Army War College.

Collins was appointed the Adjutant General of Mississippi by Governor Phil Bryant in January 2012, and was promoted to Major General in March 2012. He leads a ready force of more than 12,275 Citizen-Soldiers and Airmen. He also serves as the director of the Mississippi Military Department, and oversees the development and coordination of all policies, plans and programs of the Mississippi National Guard in concert with the Governor and legislature of the State.

He refers to his military career as his greatest accomplishment. General Collins commanded 3,000 Mississippi soldiers—the 155th Armored Brigade in Iraq at the time of Hurricane Katrina. Being in Iraq during that time was a memorable experience for him because he witnessed the strength of his troop. He stated, "Twenty-seven soldiers went into combat with me who did not come back. I live with that number. I'll never forget them because they gave everything they had." Troops were forced to place their personal lives on hold to fight for the betterment of the country. Unaware of their living conditions back home and dealing with the grievances of other soldiers, the troops remained focused on the task at hand.

General Collins has won many awards over the course of his military career including the Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and the Mississippi Longevity Medal.

He appreciates his experience gained while serving his country so the decision to retire was not easy. Though he will no longer be in uniform, he plans to continue working and spending more time with family. I consider General Collins a friend and he was always a consummate professional and there for me and my staff when we needed his assistance. His presence in command will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Adjutant Major General Augustus L. Collins, for his duty to his country, his state, and his troops. Thank you for your service.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jackson, Mississippi native, Major General Augustus L. Collins, Adjutant General of Mississippi, who also serves as the commanding General of both the Mississippi Army and Air National Guard.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MIT/WELLESLEY UPWARD BOUND PROGRAM

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the MIT/Wellesley Upward Bound Program. The program offers excellent teaching and consistent mentoring; and it has proved that young people whose parents have not themselves benefitted from higher education can succeed academically. Each year, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and Wellesley College provide year round educational support to 50 low-income and/or first generation youth in grades 9–12, from the city of Cambridge, Massachusetts. The program's goal is to give its participants the skills, confidence, and determination to graduate from high school and succeed in postsecondary education.

MIT/Wellesley Upward Bound provides an intensive six-week summer session, conducted in residence at Wellesley College. Rigorous academic courses are taught by experienced high school teachers and graduate and undergraduate students from MIT, Wellesley College, and other local colleges and universities. Classes stress English and foreign language arts; reading, writing, oral communication, social studies and critical thinking. Plus, quantitative skills, mathematics, laboratory sciences, and the use of computers. Individual tutorials are available on an as-needed basis, and the academic rigor is enriched by cultural activities and field trips.

During the academic year, participants attend supervised study sessions and one-on-one tutorials, for a minimum of four hours per week, at MIT. Participants must meet with program staff regularly to review their academic progress and participation performance. Additionally, the program provides college admissions, financial aid, and career advice workshops to participants and their parents.

About 80–85 percent of Cambridge public school students who participate enroll in postsecondary education. I salute the remarkable success of the Upward Bound Program. For 50 years, MIT and Wellesley students have made an immense difference in the lives of less fortunate young people, and we draw inspiration from everyone associated with this extraordinary program.

IN RECOGNITION OF TOMMY KONO

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the late Tommy Kono for being an American champion. Mr. Kono is the most decorated American in the history of weightlifting. He was born and raised in Sacramento and suffered from asthma, making

him unable to participate in physical activity. At the age of eleven, Mr. Kono and his family were moved to Tule Lake Relocation Center following passage of Executive Order 9066. While there, Mr. Kono began lifting weights and joined a bodybuilding club. This marked the beginning of Mr. Kono's passion for weightlifting.

After three years, Mr. Kono was released and returned to Sacramento, enrolling in Sacramento High School. Despite being known as the "a 98 pound weakling" when he was younger, he entered into local weightlifting competitions and began winning. With the start of the Korean War, Mr. Kono was scheduled to deploy to Asia, but the military allowed him to stay in the United States after learning he was a contender for the 1952 Olympic team.

Mr. Kono was an individual who was devoted to his country; he was a Japanese American who was able to embrace new opportunities after World War II. Mr. Kono won his first gold medal in 1952 and won a silver medal at the 1960 Olympics. Mr. Kono went on to win several bodybuilding competitions, made the cover of national magazines, and earned attention of fellow athletes when he set world records in four weight classes. After retiring, Mr. Kono invested his time coaching aspiring champions, including young lifters in Sacramento and Hawaii, as well as tutoring high school students in Sacramento. Mr. Kono passed away in April in Honolulu.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Tommy Kono for being an American champion, as well as a mentor to young adults in the Sacramento area. While family, friends, and mentees gather together to celebrate Mr. Kono, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring his outstanding work of service to his country as well as his commitment to his community.

CONGRATULATING ALLAN
WEEGAR ON HIS RETIREMENT
FROM THE CITY OF HURST,
TEXAS

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Allan Weegar, City Manager to the City of Hurst, Texas, on his retirement after thirty-five years of dedicated service.

Allan's distinguished career with the city began in 1981 as assistant to the City Manager. Soon after, Allan was promoted to Assistant City Manager of Administration. In 1997, Allan was selected to serve as City Manager, a role he would excel at for nearly twenty years.

While serving his community, Allan has become a member of the International City Management Association, Texas City Management Association, Northeast Leadership Forum, and is a past-president of the North Texas City Management Association. In addition, Allan currently serves on the board of directors for Texas City Management Association, Northeast Transportation System and the Hurst-Euless-Bedford Economic Development Foundation.

Allan's vision and dedication to his city have brought forward a period of economic develop-

ment and productivity which has revitalized Hurst and the surrounding communities. Allan's dedication to providing excellent customer service to the citizens he serves has set a tremendous example for those in public service. Allan has established a culture of leadership and development within the City of Hurst that has driven its prosperity and success over the last two decades.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize Allan and his outstanding service to the City of Hurst. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Allan Weegar on his well-deserved retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present in the House chamber for certain roll call votes on Monday, July 11th and Tuesday, July 12th for the first vote series. Had I been present, I would have voted 'aye' for roll calls 401, 402, 403, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, and 415 and 'nay' on roll calls 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, and 416.

SUGAR LAND HOSPITAL EARNS TOP GRADE FOR PATIENT SAFETY

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Houston Methodist Sugar Land Hospital for earning an "A" for patient safety.

For almost two decades, Houston Methodist Sugar Land Hospital has been a critical partner in the Fort Bend County community. Twice a year, Hospital Safety Scores are assigned to over 2,500 hospitals across the United States. Developed under the guidance of Leapfrog's Blue Ribbon Expert Panel, the Hospital Safety Score is an elite designation which sets the highest standards for patient safety. Houston Methodist Sugar Land Hospital was one of less than one-third of those inspected to earn an "A" for patient safety. Fort Bend County residents are blessed to be under the care of some of the nation's best doctors, nurses, technicians, and staff, who provide excellent care for the patients that pass through their doors. I commend all of these men and women for their hard work and dedication.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to the Houston Methodist Sugar Land Hospital for receiving an "A" in patient safety. Thank you for all that you do for Fort Bend County.

TRIBUTE TO LOU AND PHILIP FUNK

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Lou and Philip

Funk of Avoca, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They were married on May 28, 1966 in Racine, Wisconsin.

Lou and Philip's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, I hope it is filled with happy memories. May their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

I salute this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Lou and Philip on this momentous occasion.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$19,366,974,554,360.50. We've added \$8,740,097,505,447.42 to our debt in 7 years. This is over \$8.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING LEBANON MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a resourceful church, Lebanon Missionary Baptist Church.

The Lebanon Missionary Baptist Church had its beginning in 1869, when the congregation worshipped under a "brush harbor" with the Reverend David Adams serving as pastor and founder.

Realizing the need for a structure in which to worship, the pastor and members put forth every effort to design and construct the first church. The building was erected approximately 60 to 70 feet from the old church site.

As we look back over the 147-year history of Lebanon, we are reminded of the loyal devotion of the early pioneers and their steadfastness to the cause of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. We attribute any success or progress of this church to their loyalty.

The Reverend David Adams served faithfully as pastor until his death; and the Reverend Riley Russell accepted the call as pastor and served diligently until his death. Some of the early pastors were the Reverends: S.D. Smith; Joe Baskin; Dan Anderson; Connelly; J. A. Johnson; Pleasant Fractions; Jimmy Mines; and J. Carter.

The Lebanon Missionary Baptist Church is recognized as the oldest land grant church in this area. It has served as a torch shining forth "her" brilliant light in this community. This light of hope and compassion has compelled many to come to Christ.

No church can survive without the dedicated cooperation of its members. The long, successful history of Lebanon is due to the dedicated, cooperative efforts of the many pastors, deacons, church mothers, and general congregation.

Some of the early deacons were: Brothers Joe Hodges; Pink Roseby; Ben Friar; C. H. Benson; R. B. Roseby; Richard Epps; Michael C. Smith; George Friar; and Tom Randle.

In 1912, the first church was destroyed by a violent storm. The force of the storm served as the epitome for the rebuilding of the second church, and its completion was the epoch of the old church site.

Some of the pioneer members of the Mothers Board were: Sisters Ophelia Anderson; Mary Benson; Sara Smith; Mary Anderson; Lucy Hunter; Hassie Montgomery; Harriet Craighead; Mattie L. Benson; Martha Ross Benson; and Sallie Epps.

Still moving forward, the Reverend A. W. Jones accepted the call as pastor. He served well until his accepting the call of another church. Following Reverend Jones, the Reverends: C. D. Brown; C. L. Clark; George Harper; Aaron Barron; and Melvin Lewis served as pastor of Lebanon.

Deacons serving under these administrations were: Brothers West Benson; Eddie Donelson; Leslie Hodges; Edgar Waddell; Pinkney Benson; Daniel Mickey; Daniel Kimbrough; Ira Blake; Mack Friar; O. W. Hodges; Mack McKennie; Samuel Friar; Charles Quincy Spurlin; Jessie Harmon; L. B. Hathorn; Alphonso Wright; Jacob J. McClain; and Charlie Benson.

The Mothers Board consisted of: Sisters Harriet Friar, Hallie Donelson, Elmira Horton, Minnie Hodges, Lyda Friar, Mary V. Hodges, Rebecca Kimbrough, Bessie Green, Roberta Blake, Priscilla Benson, Lillie Waddell, Mamie McKennie, Mary L. Friar, Mattie L. Hodges, Paralee McClain, Frankie Hodges, Eula Spurlin, Callie McKennie, Willie Mae Meeks, Ollie Harmon, and Olivia Garnett.

The edifice of the old church underwent many changes such as: lowering the ceilings; modern light fixtures; paneling of the sanctuary; bricking; and the construction of a kitchen and fellowship hall. Sanctuary pews, a communion table, and new pulpit furniture were purchased to enhance the décor of the church. These ventures of improvement were all completed under the leadership of the Reverend Aaron Barron.

Reverend Barron served as pastor for 27 consecutive years. He was a faithful and dynamic minister of the Gospel. During his administration, many souls realized the need for peace in their lives—that peace that surpassed all understanding—and accepted Christ as their personal Savior. Reverend Aaron Barron exchanged mortality for immortality and entered unto eternity in October 1983, while serving as pastor of Lebanon.

In January 1984, the Reverend Melvin B. Lewis accepted the call and served as pastor until 1987. Under the leadership of Reverend Lewis, a pastor's study was constructed, central heat and air conditioning was installed, and an organ was purchased for the sanctuary.

In June 1987, the Reverend J. W. Redmond accepted the call to serve as pastor of Lebanon. The church was blessed with many members, an Inspirational Choir, and Evangelist Quinzola McKennie.

Brothers: Coy Henderson; Leslie McKennie; Charlie Wright; Larry McKennie; and Paul Gilmore were installed as deacons. Installed on the Mothers Board were Sisters: Ola Mae Bailey, Priscilla Anderson, Grace Kimbrough, Rose Gibson, and as Deaconess were Sisters: Minnie McKennie, Sharon Wright, and Annie Gilmore.

Under the leadership of Reverend Redmond, a new roof was installed on the church, the choir stand was elevated and carpeted, floral arrangements and doors were added to the sanctuary. Following the leadership of the pastor, the Lebanon Inspirational Choir dedicated to the church some choir robes, and added mirrors and double doors to the sanctuary, remodeled and refurnished the pastor's study. The Friar and Montgomery families dedicated chandeliers to enhance the entrance of the church.

Reverend Redmond exchanged mortality for immortality and entered unto eternity in January 2000, while serving as pastor of Lebanon Church.

After the death of Reverend Redmond, the Reverend Walter Eskridge, Jr. accepted the call to serve as pastor of the Lebanon Missionary Baptist Church in October 2000.

Under the leadership of Reverend Eskridge, the church has been blessed with many new members and rededications. A new church building was erected on land given to the church by Sis. Earsalean McClain's family, and the doors were opened for the first service on July 4, 2004; new choir robes were purchased for LSC, LIC, and LYC; a television and VCR were purchased through the aid of the Home Mission Society; Discipleship and New Members classes were started; the Fellowship Hall has been named the Earsalean McClain Fellowship Hall in memory of Sis. Earsalean McClain; the Educational Wing has been named the Martha Ross Benson Educational Wing in memory of Sis. Martha Ross Benson; each classroom has been named in memory of: Class Number 1—Deacon Samuel Friar; Class Number 2—Mother Elmira Horton; Class Number 3—Mother Lillie Waddell; Nursery—Mothers Callie McKennie and Roberta Blake; Choir Room—Sister Levirda Dixon and Bro. Eric Friar; and the Business Office in honor of Deacon Jessie Harmon, and the church is growing through his ministry. A new roof "The Red Top" was installed on the church. On June 7, 2015 Bro. Andrew Lee Brown was crowned as Deacon.

The Lebanon Missionary Baptist Church's current Deacons and Trustees Board members are Brothers: Jessie Harmon; Coy Henderson; Lawrence McKennie; Andrew Brown; and Sisters: Lula Friar; Lillie Benson Green; and Earline Wright Hart.

The present Mothers Board members are Sisters: Ollie Harmon and Deaconess, Sister Annie Gilmore.

Through these many years of service to God and mankind, the Lebanon Missionary Baptist Church has survived many trials and tribulations, but are determined that forces of evil will not hinder them nor separate them from the love of God.

The torch carried by the pioneer members of the Lebanon Missionary Baptist Church, cast rays of light across their pathway. This light gives the church hope of a brighter future for the church. Those following will raise that torch high and keep the light burning bright. They will trim their lamps, put on the whole

armor of God, and continue to hold up the blood stained banner.

It is with this same spirit as soldiers going forth to war, accented with Christian love, devotion and dedication to the cause of the Kingdom, which the history of the Lebanon Missionary Baptist Church continues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the historic Lebanon Missionary Baptist Church.

HONORING THE STENNIS CENTER PROGRAM FOR CONGRESSIONAL INTERNS

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this summer marks the 14th year in which interns working in Congressional offices have benefited from a program run by the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Leadership. This six-week program is designed to enhance their internship experience by giving them an inside look at how Congress works and a deeper appreciation for the role that Congress plays in our democracy. Each week, the interns meet with senior congressional staff and other experts to discuss issues such as the legislative process, power of the purse, foreign policy, the media, and more.

Interns are selected based on their college record, community service experience, and interest in a career in public service. This year, 30 outstanding interns participated in the program. Most of them are juniors and seniors in college who are working in Republican and Democratic offices in both the House and Senate, including one in my office, Shannon McConnell.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the interns for their involvement in this valuable program. I also thank the Stennis Center and the Senior Stennis Fellows for providing such a meaningful experience for these interns and for encouraging them to consider a future career in public service.

I submit a list of the 2016 Stennis Congressional Interns and the offices in which they work.

Amanda Bennett, attending Bowdoin College, interning in the office of U.S. Senator ANGUS KING;

Max Boyd, attending University of Cincinnati, interning in the office of U.S. Representative PATRICK MCHENRY;

Jack Bryan, attending Mississippi State University, interning in the office of U.S. Senator THAD COCHRAN;

Allie Bull, attending Johns Hopkins University, interning in the office of U.S. Senator BERNIE SANDERS;

Anna Caliandro, attending Smith College, interning in the office of U.S. Senator BERNIE SANDERS;

Maggie Callahan, attending Mercer University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative KEITH ROTHFUS;

Daniel Russell Cheung, attending University of California, Berkeley, interning in the office of U.S. Representative MIKE HONDA;

Nick Descamps, attending Occidental College, interning in the office of U.S. Senator STEVE DAINES;

Matt Dougherty, attending Suffolk University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative ROBERT BRADY;

Maggie Duff, attending Mississippi State University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative STEVEN PALAZZO;

Elina Fisher, attending The George Washington University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative SETH MOULTON;

Emily George, attending University of Idaho, interning in the office of U.S. Representative DAN NEWHOUSE;

Easton Gragg, attending Wake Forest University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative PATRICK MCHENRY;

Gary Haglund, attending Boston College, interning on the House Committee on the Budget;

Katelyn Harris, attending Vanderbilt University, interning on the House Committee on Education and the Workforce;

Kate Henjum, attending University of Colorado Boulder, interning in the office of U.S. Senator MICHAEL BENNET;

Victoria Hill, attending American University School of International Service, interning in the office of U.S. Representative JOAQUIN CASTRO;

Conley Hurst, attending Washington and Lee University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative FRENCH HILL;

Jessica Isler, attending Alma College, interning in the office of U.S. Senator DEBBIE STABENOW;

Jayden Raye Lapin-Tatman, attending University of California, Berkeley, interning in the office of U.S. Representative JANICE HAHN;

Diane Lee, attending Pomona College, interning in the office of U.S. Representative TED LIEU;

Shannon McConnell, attending University of California, San Diego, interning in the office of U.S. Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL;

Anna Perez, attending New York University Shanghai, interning in the office of U.S. Senator THAD COCHRAN;

Tony Rogari, attending University of Notre Dame, interning in the office of U.S. Representative TED LIEU;

Christian Ryan, attending Marymount University, interning on the House Committee on Appropriations;

Jared Sutton, attending Drew University, interning in the office of U.S. Representative MARIO DIAZ-BALART;

Marielle Thete, attending Wheaton College, interning in the office of U.S. Senator ANGUS KING;

Quin Wetzel, attending Michigan State University, interning on the Senate Committee on the Budget;

Stephanie Xiao, attending University of Virginia, interning in the office of U.S. Representative GREGORIO SABLAN; and,

Katelyn Zimmerman, attending Georgetown University, interning on the House Committee on Education and the Workforce.

HONORING MS. DONNIE NEELY FOR HER 50 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE

HON. ERIC A. "RICK" CRAWFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Donnie Neely for her 50 years of service at Baxter Healthcare Corporation in Mountain Home, Arkansas.

On June 7, 1966, Ms. Neely reported for her first day of work at Baxter's Mountain Home, Arkansas plant which had opened just two years earlier. She planned to work only three months to buy school clothes for her kids. Now 50 years later she is still with the plant. Ms. Neely operates a machine making injection molding parts used in numerous healthcare settings, and the parts she makes are shipped to manufacturing sites around the world. She has always felt pride about the work she does, particularly when seeing those products in action while visiting relatives in the hospital. Ms. Neely is known by her supervisor as the model employee, someone who can be depended on every day, and an employee who works well with all her coworkers.

Ms. Neely's commitments extend to her family. Her daughter now works at the plant as well. She got those school clothes, and much more, thanks to her mom's dedication to Baxter Mountain Home.

I thank Ms. Neely for her fifty years of dedicated and faithful service in Arkansas.

HONORING CARL JUNCTION POSTMASTER SHARON CLARK

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Carl Junction, Missouri, Postmaster Sharon Clark for her eight years of service as Carl Junction Postmaster and to congratulate her on retirement.

After holding the position for the past eight years, Sharon retired from her position on June 3rd of this year. Since her arrival in February of 2008, Sharon has overseen the post office in its upgrade to "First Class" post office status. During her tenure she has also increased the visibility, and engagement of the post office in the Carl Junction community.

During her time serving as postmaster, Sharon had made many meaningful contributions, including Carl Junction's success in the annual "Stamp out Breast Cancer" campaign. This is a nationwide annual contest each October between post offices to sell the most breast cancer awareness postage stamps to aid in funding breast cancer research. Since Sharon's first year in 2008, the Carl Junction post office has ranked in the top ten for selling these stamps and has won this national competition each of the last three years. This achievement could not have been done without her hard work and determination.

In addition to her role as postmaster, Sharon has been active in the Carl Junction com-

munity. She serves in several capacities including Carl Junction Bright Futures, Habitat for Humanity, Hope 4 You Breast Cancer Foundation, Carl Junction C.A.R.E.S., and the Carl Junction Eastern Star. Sharon also serves on the Carl Junction Area Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors and plans to use her retirement to be "more active" in the community.

Mr. Speaker, Sharon Clark's work as Carl Junction Postmaster has set a great example of public service for the people of Carl Junction. I am proud to recognize citizens like her in Missouri's Seventh Congressional District, and I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating her on her well-deserved retirement and service.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BRANT LAKE CAMP

HON. ELISE M. STEFANK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Ms. STEFANK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the 100th Anniversary of the Brant Lake Camp in Warren County, New York. Located in the beautiful Adirondack Mountains, the Brant Lake Camp has served as a summer retreat for boys looking to enjoy their vacations while learning the core values that accompany individual and team sports.

In 1916, three young teachers traveled to Brant Lake from New York City searching for a spot to establish a summer camp. Bob Gerstenzang, Jack Malloy and Joseph "Unc" Eberly decided to buy a plot of local farm land, and had the camp up and running by the summer of 1917. For the next 100 years, Brant Lake Camp has stayed in the hands of the Gerstenzang family. The family's legacy continues thanks to the current camp directors Robert Gersten (Emeritus), Karen Gerstenzang Metzler (Emeritus), Richard Gersten (Executive Director), and Max Gersten, all of whom are descendants of founder Bob Gerstenzang. The camp has grown from the original thirty-two campers during that first summer to the 330 campers now annually hosted. As the camp has grown, directors Dave Cramoy and Andy Berlin, both long-time Brant Lakers, have joined the leadership team.

Brant Lake Camp has four core sports programs along with secondary sport instruction and waterfront activities. The camp fosters the idea of "appropriate competitiveness" in order to instill the benefits of competition while still encouraging a friendly environment. The focus of the camp is not necessarily sporting itself, but the values that come with competing and learning in a safe arena.

All of the activities offered are aimed at fostering the feeling that Brant Lake Boys are a family. For a century now, the tight knit community of Brant Lake Camp has been helping campers to expand their horizons and challenge themselves to push beyond that which they first thought possible.

Congratulations to the Brant Lake Camp on the 100th anniversary of its founding. I want to wish the camp, its campers, and its alumni continued success heading into its next hundred years.

DR. CRISTAL M. ALBRECHT
LEADS THE NATIONAL COUNCIL
FOR WORKFORCE EDUCATION
BOARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Alvin Community College President Dr. Cristal M. Albrecht for being appointed as the president of the National Council for Workforce Education. Dr. Albrecht has served on the board for many years, including many roles such as Regional Director, Vice President of Government Relations and Executive Committee Member.

The National Council for Workforce Education serves as the national forum to affect and direct the future role of two-year and other postsecondary institutions in workforce education and economic development. I'm confident Dr. Albrecht will help provide outstanding conferences and offering a forum for practitioners to learn from each other's best practices.

On behalf of all residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, I'm pleased to recognize Dr. Cristal M. Albrecht and her contributions to the Alvin community as well as helping to improve postsecondary education across America. We are all proud of Dr. Albrecht and wish her the best of luck as President of the National Council for Workforce Education Board.

TRIBUTE TO CONNIE AND GARY
ALGER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Connie and Gary Alger of Clarinda, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They were married on May 29, 1966 at Westminster United Presbyterian Church in Clarinda.

Connie and Gary's lifelong commitment to each other, their children and grandchildren truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, I hope it is filled with happy memories. May their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

I salute this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Connie and Gary on this momentous occasion.

HONORING SWEET CANAAN
CHURCH OF GOD IN CHRIST

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise day to honor a historic church, Sweet

Canaan Church of God in Christ. It has shown what can be done through the years of dedication of a progressive church.

The historic Sweet Canaan Church of God in Christ, which is the second oldest Church of God in Christ in the World and is located at: 1946 Bellbottom Road in Lexington, MS 39095.

"The first church added to the number professing sanctification was located in Carroll (Holmes) County sixteen or seventeen miles north of Lexington, Mississippi." This statement is from the book: "Fifty Years Achievement from 1906-1956 A PERIOD IN HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF GOD IN CHRIST"; By Charles H. Pleas, reprint 1991 p 5. The Editorial note stated: The Historic Sweet Canaan church is located near the Carroll County line but it is actually in northern Holmes County just south of Carroll County.

Sweet Canaan began as a little prayer mission in a wayside house of Professor Allen Taylor. Allen Taylor's property was located on Bell Bottom Road which is located about ten to fifteen miles north of Lexington. During those days Elder Morgan Williams was in charge of the small congregation. In the year 1909, the prayer mission decided to organize itself and the name Sweet Canaan was chosen. Prior to selecting the name Sweet Canaan, the church was known as the "Colored Sanctified Church." It was through continuous fervent prayer that other community people soon joined the early saints.

The present site of Sweet Canaan was once the spot where cattle of Professor Taylor grazed. Professor Taylor donated the land to the church for the sum of twenty dollars (\$20.00), a legal formality.

Although the small congregation did not have seats, the community was blessed. Mr. Isaac Randle was given a few dollars to bring some sweet gum logs to be used as seats in the prayer mission. Recognizing the small congregation's perseverance, Bishop Charles Harrison Mason, Founder of the Church of God In Christ, appointed Elder Jeffery A. Lewis as their first pastor. He was also appointed the first Overseer of the State of Mississippi. At that time, the whole state was under one jurisdiction.

Sweet Canaan is blessed to have had its first three pastors to serve as state overseers; they were Elder Jeffery Lewis, Elder Stephen Rice, and Elder James Henderson. Sweet Canaan is also blessed to have had the jurisdictional supervisor of women for northern Mississippi, Mother Sarah Ann Braggs Gaston, as a member during her youth. Bishop Timothy Titus, Prelate of Northern Mississippi Jurisdiction, preached at Historic Sweet Canaan during his early years as a young preacher. The late Bishop Louis Henry Ford, former Presiding Bishop of the Church of God in Christ, often talked about his experience when he preached at Sweet Canaan, when he was a child and a student at Saint Academy and College in Lexington.

The first State Holy Convocation of the Church of God In Christ was held at Historic Sweet Canaan.

Former Pastors of Sweet Canaan were: Elder J.A. Lewis, Elder Stephen Rice, Elder Fred Winans, Elder W.B. Hedges, Elder D.R. Curry, Elder James Lee, Elder James Henderson, Elder D. Pitchford, Elder J.L. Pleas, Superintendent Fred Wade, and currently Elder Dr. Percy Washington, Sr.

The first deacons of Sweet Canaan were Brother Phillip Blake, Brother Louis Brooks and Brother Charlie Randle, and Mother Abbie Banks was the church mother.

Some of the early saints of Sweet Canaan were: Professor Allen Taylor, Brother Louis Brooks, Brother Willis Randle, Brother Frank Blake, Brother Jessie Banks, Brother Frank Hoover, Brother Ben Simmons, Mother Sara Booker, Mother Ina Jenkins, Mother Ida Wilson, Mother Abbie Banks, Mother Ella Taylor, Mother Emma Brooks, and Deacon Payton Smith.

The present pastor, Elder Dr. Percy Louis Washington, was appointed to serve on May 18, 2003 by Bishop T.T. Scott. Pastor Washington and his lovely wife, Glenda, have five sons and nine grandchildren.

He and the Sweet Canaan congregation have worked hard together to preserve the history of Sweet Canaan by enclosing the whole building inside the Dr. Tyree and Mary Carr Multipurpose Building. The beautiful Carr Multipurpose Building houses not only the entire historic church, but it houses the fellowship hall, residential quarters, office and classroom space.

On July 18, 2013, Bishop Charles Edward Blake, the Pastor of West Angeles Cathedral in Los Angeles, California, and the Presiding Bishop of the Church of God in Christ, Inc., visited Historic Sweet Canaan. They were joined at Sweet Canaan by General Board Members, Bishop Brandon Porter of Memphis, Tennessee, and Bishop Wooten of St. Louis, Missouri. Also joining Bishop Blake were several other bishops and more than half of the Trustee Board of the Church of God in Christ.

Pastor Washington has said many times; "When I went to Sweet Canaan, on my way to the church I saw many cows. When I got to the church I saw a honey bee hive in the back of the church. I knew I was in the right place. For I was in the Land of Milk and Honey—in the land of Canaan—Sweet Canaan."

Sweet Canaan oftentimes invites many to praise and worship with them every Sunday. Their Prayer service begins at 9:00 a.m., Sunday school starts at 9:30 a.m., and Sunday Worship Service starts at 11:00 am.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the historic Sweet Canaan Church of God in Christ.

IN MEMORY OF ERNEST HARRY
"PETE" DENT SR.

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today, July 13, 2016, a funeral service was held for Pete Dent at Good Shepherd Lutheran Church in Columbia, South Carolina. As a dedicated family man and respected business leader, he will be greatly missed. I am grateful for his service as a member of the U.S. Air Force and I would like to extend my deep sympathy to his family during this time of mourning. He will be buried at Fort Jackson National Cemetery.

A thoughtful obituary was published in The State newspaper on July 12, 2016:

COLUMBIA.—A funeral service for Ernest Harry "Pete" Dent Sr., 82, will be held at

11:00 a.m. Wednesday, July 13, 2016, at Good Shepherd Lutheran Church. Burial will be in Fort Jackson National Cemetery at a later date. The family will receive friends following the funeral service in the Family Activities Building at the church. Dunbar Funeral Home, Devine Street Chapel, is assisting the family.

Mr. Dent died Sunday, July 10, 2016. Born in Columbia, he was a son of the late Arthur Kibler Dent Sr. and Elinor Stiller Dent. He was a member of the U.S. Air Force Class of 55K Bantam, stationed at Spence AFB in Moultrie, Ga. He enjoyed a 30+ year career selling automobiles in Columbia, primarily Chevrolets with Love Automotive and Central Chevrolet. Many of his long term friendships were initiated from his auto sales. In his post-retirement years, he enjoyed his part-time work with Lorick Office Products, allowing him more opportunities to spend time with his son. He was a member of Woodlands Country Club where he enjoyed his weekly rounds of golf with friends and family.

Surviving are his wife, Mary T. Dent; son and daughter-in-law, Harry and Andrea Dent; daughter and son-in-law, Patti and Shawn O'Rourke; grandchildren, Ernest Harry "Trae" Dent III, Aydan Leigh O'Rourke, Ryan Michael O'Rourke; stepson, Tony Ramsay; stepdaughter, Tanya Ramsay Daniels (J. Sam); and stepgrandson, Holt Daniels; first wife and lifelong friend, Nadine Cantey and "husband-in-law", John B. Cantey. He was predeceased by a granddaughter, Ashley Nicole Dent.

In lieu of flowers, donations may be made to The Ashley Dent Foundation, 303 N. Woodlake Drive, Columbia, SC 29229-8933, where funds will be directed to organizations participating in Alzheimer's research.

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL
OF THE TOWN OF BRASELTON,
GEORGIA

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Town of Braselton, Georgia. Braselton is located partially in the Ninth Congressional District, which I proudly represent. The town limits straddle four different counties, and spreads into adjoining districts represented by my fellow Georgians, Mr. WOODALL and Mr. HICE.

The town has a rich history. In 1884, John Oliver Braselton opened a general merchandise store and laid the foundation for what would become the great town of Braselton.

Braselton quickly became a prominent economic and geographic center in Northeast Georgia and prompted town officials to seek legal incorporation on August 21, 1916.

John Oliver Braselton's three sons expanded the original general store to include a bank, a grocery store, and a feed and seed outlet all while maintaining its reputation as a social center of town.

Transformational events paved the way for the growth and prosperity of the town, including the creation of a rail spur and state highways, the continued development of the Braselton Brothers Store, and Governor Ernest Vandiver's decision to route I-85 through the Town. The long term investments and vision of town leaders, the strength of small

businesses, and most importantly the genuine families, all played a large role in creating the community that is Braselton today.

As a sign of its stability and strong family ties, Braselton has elected only 5 mayors in its 100 year history: William Henry Braselton, Lewis Braselton, Henry Edward Braselton, Pat Graham and Bill Orr.

The town's first one hundred years will always be remembered, and have paved the way for its second century of growth and success. I join in saluting Braselton's Centennial Celebration and congratulating its citizens on this wonderful occasion.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JEAN
CARLOS MENDEZ PEREZ

HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Jean Carlos Mendez Perez, who lived in Kissimmee, Florida, and was a resident of my district. Jean lost his life during the tragic shooting at Pulse nightclub in the early morning hours of June 12, 2016. He was 35 years old.

Jean moved to Florida from Puerto Rico when he was a teenager. He quickly made friends and built a new life for himself. He was charming, full of life and had a warmth that everyone loved to be around. Jean loved indulging his nieces and nephews with candy and ice cream. He was humorous and fun-loving.

Jean was a salesman at a perfume store. He assisted a customer, Luis Daniel Wilson-Leon, several years ago, who would become his partner in life. Their friends described the moment they met as "love at first sight," and the beginning of their nine-year relationship. The two shared a home, frequented their favorite Hispanic restaurants and loved going to Latin Night at the Pulse club.

Jean and Luis were together at the club on the night of the shooting. The couple died alongside one another that night.

Jean Carlos Mendez Perez will never be forgotten in our pursuit of a more just and loving world. His loving spirit and acts of kindness will live forever in the hearts and minds of those who knew him.

May his family, relatives and friends eventually find solace and comfort, and may he rest in eternal peace.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CAROLYN
RADCLIFF

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a remarkable woman, Carolyn Radcliff, who passed away peacefully on June 17th. Carolyn was a devoted and distinguished public servant. Many of those years were spent here on Capitol Hill as an Administrative Assistant for myself, my predecessor, Rep. Norman Lent (NY) and Rep. William Royer (CA). Prior to her Congressional service, Carolyn served as a Con-

fidential Assistant to the County Supervisor, San Mateo, CA, and as Legal Secretary to the Assistant District Attorney, San Mateo County.

No one questioned Carolyn's love for life. Her laugh was contagious. Her outlook and positive spirit were unmatched. Yet nothing surpassed her devotion and love for her family, especially her son Tadd and her four grandchildren: Cody, Sam, Laney and Cooper. Every holiday and birthday was a required trip to Janesville, WI.

I extend my condolences to Carolyn's family and the many individuals who were honored to call her a friend. She will be missed but never forgotten.

HONORING THE GILFIELD M.B.
CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Gilfield M.B. Church in Doddsville, Mississippi. The church was founded and built by slaves on the banks on the Sunflower River located on the plantation of United States Senator James O. Eastland in 1894.

The history of the church spans 122 years with records showing three structures as its home, each with its own fascinating and remarkable journey. Early records of the church were recalled and passed down by word of mouth from slaves down to the members of the church which were also relatives. The earliest written record of the church was around the 1980s. Many of the elders and other members were still attending the church, so Ms. Hattie Jordan, a member of the church, volunteered to be the church historian and keeper of the records. She gathered documents, recorded oral stories, researched "leads" of where she could get more information or someone who could corroborate the findings. One source of information she relied on were two cornerstones located on the existing church front in Doddsville. One of the cornerstones was once the original place of the church in 1894, and transferred thereafter to structures one and two.

In 1894 the location of the first church was strategically planned to exist near water. It is believed but not recorded that the location was chosen because the river could be used to secretly baptize members, a practice not openly approved of by plantation owners. Ms. Jordan told the story of how she was baptized in the Sunflower River behind Gilfield M.B. Church in 1953 by Rev. McGee. Gilfield M.B. Church was allowed to exist only because Senator Eastland gave the slaves his approval.

GILFIELD M.B. CHURCH—FIRST STRUCTURE—1894 YEAR: The first pastors of Gilfield M.B. Church at its initial location were: Rev. C.C. Edwards, Rev. Hester, Rev. Hobbs, and Rev. Mose Watson. No written records were kept by slaves. The only source for handing down information was by word of mouth to the younger generation.

GILFIELD M.B. CHURCH—SECOND STRUCTURE—1921 YEAR: The second Gilfield M.B. Church was built a mile down from the first site on the banks of the Sunflower River on

the Eastland Plantation. Rev. Mose Watson was the pastor. He continued to lead the church as he did while pastoring at the first location. After Rev. Watson, the church installed Rev. Issac as the new pastor until his death in 1947. Following Rev. Issac the church was led by Rev. Latson from 1947 to 1952. Rev. Latson left for the church to move to Chicago, IL. Immediately afterwards, Rev. McGee became the pastor in 1952, but separated from the church in 1953. There was a short lapse in pastors because Rev. Fleming did not begin pastoring the church until 1954. Records indicate he was the last pastor of the second structure listed as the home of Gilfield M.B. Church.

GILFIELD M.B. CHURCH—THIRD AND CURRENT STRUCTURE—JULY 24, 1977 YEAR: Rev. Fleming moved with the church to their third home beside the site of the second home, on the banks of the Sunflower River located on the Eastland Plantation. The sanctuary section of the second site was demolished leaving the backside section to be used for church gatherings, of which it still stands today. The pastors of the third site location in order of leadership were: Rev. Fleming, Rev. John H. Williams, Rev. Clarence Tolbert, and the current pastor is Rev. Theauty Winters.

CHURCH MEMBERS (PAST AND PRESENT): Gilfield M.B. Church was founded by slaves, built by slaves, pastored by slaves, and handed to their descendants, of which many are still members. Please know that many of the member's names have yet to be recorded. Ms. Hattie Jordan is still researching the church history and compiling documents to be used in the recordings. Membership records show these individuals as the members: Sis. Hattie Young and family, Sis. Mary Pittman, Sis. Mary Ella English, Sis. Mahalia Jones and family, Sis. Lucy Williams, Sis. Lubertha Williams and family, Sis. Willie Ann Moore and family, Sis. Grace Brown, Sis. Bettie Jones and family, Sis. Louis Pittman and family, Sis. Celestine Wallace, Sis. Mirays Brown, Sis. Eddie Lee Barnes, Bro. Wiley Caples, Sis. Ruth Caples, Sis. Hattie Robinson-Jordan and family, Deacon George Roby and family, Deacon Charlie Edwards and family, Deacon Glay Smith, Deacon David Williams and family, Sis. Susie Bowie and family, Sis. Bessie Williams, Deacon Howard Lawrence and family, Brother Thomas Hudson and family, Brother Joe Henry Pittman and family, Mrs. Hattie Byrd, Sis. Magnolia Wright and family, Sis. Rose Lee Lacy and family, Bro. W.C. Williams and family, Sis. Lillie Bell Robinson and family, Sis. Linnie Triplet and family, Bro. Hays Robinson and family, Sis. Bessie Joiner, and Sis. Deloris Lawrence.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Gilfield M.B. Church of Doddsville, MS located in Sunflower County inside of the Second Congressional District of Mississippi.

HONORING MICHELLE DENISE BROWN

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Michelle Denise Brown on her re-

tirement from the Cypress Hills Local Development Corporation (CHLDC) in Cypress Hills Brooklyn, NY, where she started more than two decades ago on March 15, 1993.

As a long time community resident and prior to joining CHLDC, Michelle served as President of the P.T.A. at Public School 65 for three years. She was an active parishioner of Blessed Sacrament Church where she served as a volunteer religious education teacher for 6 years. Michelle had been attending Kingsborough Community College pursuing a Business Administration degree when she learned about the CHLDC job opportunity at the new school-based community center Beacon Program. Motivated to return to the workforce after 12 years, she applied for the position and was hired. For five years, she served as the Administrative Assistant at the Beacon School Based Community Center and the Beacon Family Place at IS 302, dividing her time with two programs. She was instrumental in the start-up of these programs which are now neighborhood institutions. Michelle set the tone of safety and caring at the Beacon while establishing intake, health and safety procedures and managing enrollment and scheduling for thousands of young people and their families.

Her exemplary work caught the attention of Ms. Neugebauer, the Executive Director who then promoted Mrs. Brown to serve as her right-hand Senior Administrative Assistant which she proudly did for the past 18 years. In addition to her administrative role, Mrs. Brown also serves as a Liaison with the Board of Directors and as the Coordinator of the Communications Committee of the organization—ensuring that the board members are aware of all CHLDC happenings and that agency's 400-plus staff and 17 offices know each other and the array of programs offered by the CHLDC and Cypress Hills Child Care Corporation.

Michelle has a wealth of knowledge and experience that will surely be missed by all who have had the pleasure to work with her, but I am certain that she is looking forward to this exciting next chapter in her life and will enjoy spending more time with her husband of 37 years, Mr. Beaufus Lee Brown, her three sons, daughter and 11 grandchildren.

I thank Michelle Denise Brown for her community service and longtime dedication to the Cypress Hill LDC community. I wish her all the best and congratulate her on her retirement.

TRIBUTE TO JANET REINERS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and congratulate Janet Reiners of Council Bluffs, Iowa, for being selected as the Together, Educators and Administrators Make It Happen Award from the Iowa State Education Association. Janet Reiners has served as the Chief Human Resources Officer for the Council Bluffs Community School District for over 19 years, and will retire from this position later this summer.

Janet Reiners received the Together, Educators and Administrators Make It Happen Award for her outstanding work in human re-

sources with the Council Bluffs Community School District as an administrator who has "worked to create a collaborative, collegial working environment for all staff." Before joining the school district staff, Janet Reiners worked in the private sector and gained valuable experience as an effective human resources officer. Ms. Reiners said she has seen many changes and requirements in education that directly affect classroom teachers and administrators. She said the human resources function and recruitment of teachers and administrators is the lifeblood of the school district. Ms. Reiners noted that, "The most important attribute the school district has is staff committed to helping children learn and grow."

I applaud and congratulate Janet Reiners for earning the Together, Educators and Administrators Make It Happen Award. She is a shining example of how hard work and dedication can affect the future of our youth and their education. I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Janet Reiners for her many accomplishments serving the Council Bluffs Community School District. I wish her continued success and the very best in her retirement.

HONORING DR. JOSEPH HAMILTON AND DR. A.V. RAMAYYA

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Vanderbilt University and two of its physics professors, Dr. Joseph Hamilton and Dr. A.V. Ramayya. Their research with an international team led to the discovery of element 117, tennesine, a new addition to the periodic table.

Their work was a collaborative effort by Vanderbilt, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the University of Tennessee, the Flerov Laboratory for Nuclear Reactions in Russia and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California. The name was chosen to honor the contributions from our region; Tennessee is only the second U.S. state to have a namesake element.

After spending decades studying superheavy element research, the team's discoveries provide new evidence for the "island of stability." Tennesine will join three other newly discovered elements to fill the seventh row of the periodic table.

Drs. Hamilton and Ramayya are the best of the best, and they have made the Volunteer State proud. Their discovery will live forever in textbooks, and they have proven once more that science is a never-ending frontier.

IN HONOR OF EDWARD H. GANT

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Edward H. Gant, for his contributions and service in the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 351 and throughout southern New Jersey.

Mr. Gant has been a member of IBEW Local 351 since he began his apprenticeship in the Spring of 1974. Mr. Gant served as an apprentice for five years before he became a full-fledged electrician in 1979. Ten years later, at the age of 36, he joined the local union executive board.

From there, he moved swiftly up the ranks and was appointed IBEW Local Union 351 President in 1994. Until his recent retirement he served as the Business Manager and Financial Secretary of the local.

As an example of his commitment to not only improving his immediate community but the state as a whole, Mr. Gant has served as President of the New Jersey State Electrical Workers Association since 2002.

Mr. Gant has served as the Secretary-Treasurer of the IBEW Local 351 Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee to advance opportunities for young people to join the workforce with gainful employment.

Ed Gant is a man who knows what it is to put in a hard day's work with your hands. Building trades jobs are some of the best jobs around but they are not always the safest. Mr. Gant understood that and donated his time to serve as the Director of the IBEW New Jersey State Lineman Safety Fund.

I had the distinct honor and privilege to work with Ed at IBEW Local 351 until my retirement to join this body, and I wish him all the best in his retirement after over 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, Edward H. Gant is a great man whose contributions toward the working men and women of this country will not be forgotten. I join with all of New Jersey in honoring the investment that he has made in his community.

HONORING HAMILTON SCHOLAR
SARAH HILL

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Seneca High School student Sarah Hill for being awarded the 2016 Hamilton Scholars Award for outstanding academic accomplishments and community service.

The Hamilton Scholars Award is presented nationally by the Alexander Hamilton Scholars, a non-profit organization designed to build leaders of character who improve our nation and our world through their service, innovation, and excellence.

To be considered for the Hamilton Scholars Award, one must be a high school junior who has demonstrated financial need, academic excellence, commitment to community service, and leadership potential. 35 to 40 students are selected each year to complete a rigorous three year program designed to provide them with practical tools for success in college and the post-college world. Students like Sarah who qualify for this incredibly selective honor exemplify top-tier diligence and academic talent.

Sarah has displayed the ability to not only excel in the classroom, but to balance her academics with such extracurricular activities as being president of her Future Business Leaders of America chapter and district, president and founder of her school's Junior State

of America, and her involvement in other such organizations as Student Council, National Honor Society, and the Fellowship of Christian Athletes.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Missouri's Seventh Congressional District, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Sarah for this distinguished achievement and wishing her the best of luck in all her future endeavors.

PASSMORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
PLACES THIRD AT THE NA-
TIONAL SEAPERCH CHALLENGE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Alvin, TX Passmore Elementary School Sea Sharks II for placing third in the Obstacle Course Challenge at the National SeaPerch Challenge at Louisiana State University.

The U.S. Navy National SeaPerch Challenge is an underwater robotics competition. The Passmore Elementary School built and operated their own remotely operated vehicles that function underwater and are designed to complete an obstacle course. The SeaPerch Challenge competition judges the students' underwater vehicles in poster and interview first, and then two underwater challenges follow. The first being an obstacle course and the second being an orbs challenge where the students move different sized balls into submerged containers. The students develop problem-solving, teamwork and technical skills through this competition. They were awarded 3rd Place in the Obstacle Course Challenge. We are very proud of what these bright young students have accomplished.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Passmore Elementary School Sea Sharks II for placing third at the National SeaPerch Challenge. Keep up the great work.

TRIBUTE TO BONNIE AND RONNIE
EBLEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Bonnie and Ronnie Eblen on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary.

Bonnie and Ronnie were married on June 3, 1956, residing now in Creston, Iowa. Their life-long commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa's values. As the years pass, may their love continue to grow even stronger and may they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many more years to come.

I salute this lovely couple on their 60 years of life together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

HONORING SYKES CHAPEL
MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable historical church, Sykes Chapel Missionary Baptist Church of Lambert, Mississippi and the great leadership it is under.

Sykes Chapel Missionary Baptist Church was founded in the 1900s by the share cropping plantation families: the Sykes family, the Noble family, the Cox family, and the McCray family. For years, there was no building for worship service. Therefore, the families went from house to house worshipping and praising God. The plantation was first-owned by Mr. Yeager who later gave it to his relative, Mr. E. H. Anderson. Mr. Anderson was more of a God-fearing man who would often attend some of the worship services, sometimes standing in the back or just stopping by one of the homes.

The Sykes family was the oldest and first family on the plantation. Therefore, the families gathered together and sold cakes to raise a little money. Afterwards, they asked Mr. Anderson to allow them to have a spot to build a church. Mr. Anderson allowed them to build a one-room shot gun building and allowed the men on the plantation to provide the labor. There was one wood heater and no air, but the families continued to praise God.

The members along with Mr. Anderson agreed to name the church Sykes Chapel Missionary Baptist Church. Afterwards, they selected a pastor to lead them. Minister Richardson was the first pastor selected. He served for a while, and later God called him home. In addition to the church, Mr. Anderson provided them with burial ground, and they called it the Sykes Chapel Cemetery. Some of the members are actually buried there.

Later, the church was destroyed twice—first by storm and later by fire. With the assistance of Mr. Anderson and loyal families, the church was rebuilt twice. After rebuilding the church, they had worship service once a month. The church has been under the leadership of several pastors: Rev. Harry Benimon, Rev. Rollie Lee, Rev. Arthur Lee, Rev. Lloyd Johnson, and Rev. Robert Griffin.

Pastor Lloyd Johnson enjoyed praising God. He encouraged members to attend church every Sunday, and the membership increased. He later had a vision to build a larger sanctuary. In the process of preparing to build a larger church, no deed was found. Several deacons, including Deacon Albert Emerson, Deacon James Lee McCray, Deacon Ollie McCray, and Deacon Eddie Moore went to Mr. Anderson to inquire about the deed, and he sold the land to Sykes Chapel Missionary Baptist Church for \$1.00. In addition to the new sanctuary, a bus and van were purchased; outreach ministries and abstinence programs were started. Pastor Johnson served as pastor for seventeen years, until God called him home.

God sent Pastor Robert Griffin, who served for approximately four years. Under his leadership, the church continued to praise God. The youth ministry flourished, and the church was paid off in one and a half years.

Currently, Sykes Chapel Missionary Baptist Church is under the leadership of Pastor Derell Wiley. He believes that we can truly move mountains through prayer and faith. His established mission for Sykes Chapel is: "Exalting the Savior, Equipping the Saints, and Evangelizing the Sinner." In his vision, souls are saved, minds are renewed, hearts are cleansed, and members are rejuvenated. He emphasizes that the atmosphere will be shifted and a change will occur when we work together and embrace others with love, for God is love.

They are a little country church, but they serve an awesome God, who is able to transform minds, spirits, and lives. Under Pastor Wiley's leadership, they are growing physically and spiritually—studying and standing on the word of God. The following ministries have been started: Youth Ministry, Jail Ministry and Counseling, and the Convalescent Home Ministry. In addition, the church webpage, www.sykeschapel.com, was established.

By faith, they are discovering their purposes and trusting God for His promises. As God leads and guides, the future ministries will be developed: family ministries, couple ministries, and single ministries, as we become spiritually and physically prepared for God's kingdom. By faith, mountains are being moved, sinners are seeking Christ, and Christians are being restored.

The Sykes Chapel Missionary Baptist Church, believes that the greatest privilege and responsibility is to create disciples for Christ. The members are therefore committed to fulfilling their purpose through worship, fellowship, ministry, and Christian education.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Sykes Chapel Missionary Baptist Church for its dedication to serving our great community and country.

CELEBRATING THE CITY OF
DOWNEY'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LUCILE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the City of Downey on its 60th anniversary, and I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Downey and its residents on this magnificent milestone. It is my great privilege to represent this distinguished and dynamic city as part of California's 40th Congressional District.

The City of Downey, home to more than 113,000 residents, is a diverse community with a small-town friendliness located in the middle of an expansive metropolitan area. Downey, named an All-America City in 2013, was incorporated in 1956 after a lively local debate in which residents campaigned for, and ultimately won, self-governance of the formerly unincorporated Downey community.

Since that time, Downey has consistently been known for its quality residential neighborhoods, excellent schools, rich aerospace history, and engaging civic life. From the first Taco Bell restaurant and the oldest operational McDonald's, to the Apollo Space Program and Space Shuttles, Downey embodies its motto, "Future Unlimited."

Like the proponents of Downey's incorporation in the 1950s—many of whom are still ac-

tively engaged in the community—the successive generations of Downey residents have been committed to making Downey the very best it can be. City leaders continuously strive to improve the high quality of life for which the City of Downey is known, by providing the best possible service to residents, businesses, and each other in a professional, ethical, and responsible manner.

Downey has experienced significant developments during the last decade, including the revitalization of its downtown; an arts and culture movement, the city's new branding identity, Discover Downey; and, most significantly, the redevelopment of the former NASA Industrial Plant Site.

Today, the NASA site has been transformed from a vacant and blighted eyesore to a new and thriving community asset. On the northern end of the NASA site, the Downey Landing Commercial Center boasts 375,000 square feet of high-quality retail options for Downey residents. Kaiser Medical Center Downey, a new 352-bed hospital, created approximately 3,000 jobs, and has many environmentally friendly features and new medical offices. Discovery Sports Complex provided Downey residents with its first new public park space in more than 30 years.

The Columbia Memorial Space Center, which honors the crew of STS-107 lost on February 1, 2003, has been named the official national memorial to the Space Shuttle *Columbia* by a joint resolution of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. The center opened its doors in 2009 and is a popular destination for students and educators seeking to learn about space and science.

Most recent is the development of the Promenade at Downey, a 656,000-square-foot shopping center and entertainment district. The Promenade is Downey's newest community gathering spot and tourist destination, merging retail, dining, and entertainment with a one-of-a-kind walk through history.

Close to 60 years after incorporation, Downey remains a special place. Downey's indescribable essence of community is why generations of residents remain there, and why Downey continues to be a beacon to its surrounding cities. The relationships between Downey's individuals and institutions—between its community organizations, schools, local businesses, houses of worship, and residents—mean that Downey is uniquely capable of facing the challenges of the 21st century with the same spirit of vigor and commitment that created the city. This spirit will guide Downey as it continues into the "Future Unlimited," ensuring public safety, encouraging economic growth, supporting environmental responsibility, and building on its illustrious past.

I hope my colleagues will join me in celebrating Downey's 60th anniversary, and in wishing the city continued prosperity, growth, and happiness in all the years to come.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2017

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 2016

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Goodlatte amendment, which would jeopardize state efforts to clean up the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. Chair, in my home state of Maryland, at the center of the Bay watershed, there's a lot of concern about pollution behind the Conowingo Dam. The sediment and nutrients there don't just materialize out of nothing. They come from Pennsylvania, down the Susquehanna River, and are caught by the dam in Maryland. Pennsylvania's water, and pollution, doesn't stop at the Mason-Dixon line.

The Bay states have recognized the need to work together to protect the Chesapeake for three decades. But for most of that time, we haven't made the progress we need because there was no way to make sure that every state was keeping its commitment. That's why the states asked for federal assistance in 2008 and the federal government agreed to act as a backstop, giving every state the confidence to take action because they know they and their partners will be held accountable.

This has been working and has been upheld by the federal courts. The states are not asking for repeal. But this amendment would remove the accountability provisions that have been critical to the plan's success.

If Pennsylvania doesn't meet its responsibilities, Maryland sees the consequences at the Conowingo Dam. If Maryland doesn't do its job, it jeopardizes Virginia's oyster populations. We have a collaborative process in place, and our states have made significant investments and important progress. I urge my colleagues to respect the states' partnership and oppose the Goodlatte amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 2016

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately on July 11, 2016, I missed roll call vote 401.

On roll call vote 401, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of H.R. 5602, "To amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to include all funds when issuing certain geographic targeting orders, and for other purposes."

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4,

1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Com-

mittee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for

printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 14, 2016 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendments to H.R. 636, Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act.

Senate agreed to the conference report to accompany S. 524, Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5019–S5098

Measures Introduced: Thirty-seven bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3173–3209, S. Res. 530–534, and S. Con. Res. 47.

Pages S5078–80

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 2850, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program. (S. Rept. No. 114–301)

H.R. 1656, to provide for additional resources for the Secret Service, and to improve protections for restricted areas, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–302) **Page S5078**

Measures Passed:

Department of Veterans Affairs Dental Insurance Reauthorization Act: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 3055, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a dental insurance plan to veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S5035–36**

Veterans' Compensation COLA Act: Senate passed H.R. 5588, to increase, effective as of December 1, 2016, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans. **Page S5058**

Library of Congress Sound Recording and Film Preservation Programs Reauthorization Act: Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from further consideration of S. 2893, to reauthorize the sound recording and film preservation programs of the Library of Congress, and the bill was then

passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S5091–92**

Grassley (for Blunt) Amendment No. 4973, to increase the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated to the National Recording Preservation Foundation. **Page S5092**

National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped: Senate passed S. 3207, to authorize the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped to provide playback equipment in all formats. **Page S5092**

Filipino Veterans of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 1555, 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, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S5092–94**

140th Anniversary of the State of Colorado: Senate agreed to S. Res. 532, celebrating the 140th anniversary of the State of Colorado. **Page S5094**

United States Intelligence Professionals Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 533, designating July 26, 2016, as "United States Intelligence Professionals Day". **Page S5094**

Relative to the Death of Former Senator William L. Armstrong: Senate agreed to S. Res. 534, relative to the death of William L. Armstrong, former United States Senator for the State of Colorado. **Page S5094**

Conference Reports:

Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act: By 92 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 129), Senate agreed to

the conference report to accompany S. 524, to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

Pages S5022–28, S5045–58, S5058–66

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 90 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 126), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the conference report to accompany the bill.

Page S5028

House Messages:

Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act: By 89 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. 127), Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendments to H.R. 636, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations.

Pages S5028–35, S5036–41

National Defense Authorization Act House Message—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, July 14, 2016, the Chair lay before the Senate the House message to accompany S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and Senator McConnell be recognized to make a compound motion to go to conference on S. 2943; that after cloture is filed on the compound motion, the time until 11:30 a.m. be equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees, and that at 11:30 a.m., Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the compound motion to go to conference; and that if cloture is invoked, Senate agree to the compound motion to go to conference and there be two motions to instruct in order made by Senator Shaheen and Senator Sullivan; that Senator Shaheen be recognized to offer a motion to instruct the conferees, and that there be up to four minutes of debate equally divided on the motion, and that following the use or yielding back of time, Senate vote on or in relation to the Shaheen motion; following disposition of the Shaheen motion, Senator Sullivan be recognized to offer a motion to instruct the conferees and that there be up to four minutes of debate equally divided on the motion and that following the use or yielding back of that time, Senate vote on or in relation to the Sullivan motion, without intervening action or debate.

Page S5090

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 74 yeas to 18 nays (Vote No. EX. 128), Carla D. Hayden, of Maryland, to be Librarian of Congress for a term of ten years.

Pages S5041–45, S5097–98

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.

6 Army nominations in the rank of general.

29 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy.

Pages S5090–91, S5097–98

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Grant T. Harris, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace for a term of four years.

Benjamin Osorio, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022.

Mary Ellen Barbera, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2018.

John D. Minton, Jr., of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2016.

Jannette Lake Dates, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2022.

Joseph R. Donovan Jr., of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia.

Constance Smith Barker, of Alabama, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2021.

John A. Herrera, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for a term expiring April 10, 2021.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

2 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, and Navy.

Pages S5094–97

Messages from the House: **Page S5078**

Measures Referred: **Page S5078**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S5078, S5094**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5080–82**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S5082–89

Additional Statements: **Pages S5074–78**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S5089**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S5090**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S5090**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—129) **Pages S5028, S5041, S5045, S5066**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator William L. Armstrong, in accordance with S. Res. 534, at 8:04 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 14, 2016. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5094.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: NUCLEAR CRUISE MISSILE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded open and closed hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for the nuclear cruise missile, after receiving testimony from William Perry, former Secretary, John J. Hamre, former Deputy Secretary, Admiral C. D. Haney, Commander, United States Strategic Command, Robert Scher, Assistant Secretary for Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities, all of the Department of Defense; Franklin C. Miller, former Special Assistant to President George W. Bush and Senior Director for Defense Policy and Arms Control on the National Security Council; Rose Gottemoeller, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security; and Madelyn Creedon, Principal Deputy Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy.

VETERANS AFFAIRS' ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine a review of the Department of Veterans Affairs' electronic health record (VistA), progress toward interoperability with the Department of Defense's electronic health record, and plans for the future, after receiving testimony from Valerie C. Melvin, Director, Information Management and Technology Resources Issues, Government Accountability Office; Lauren Thompson, Director, Department of Defense/Veterans Affairs Interagency Program Office; and LaVerne H. Council, Assistant Secretary for Information and Technology and Chief Information Officer, and David W. Waltman, Program Executive, VistA Evolution, Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary for Health, and Jonathan R. Nebeker, Deputy Chief Medical Information Officer for Strategy and Design, both of the Veterans Health Administration, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

NASA

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness concluded a hearing to examine NASA at a crossroads, focusing on reasserting American leadership in space exploration, after receiving testimony from William H. Gerstenmaier, Associate Administrator for Human Exploration and Operations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Mary Lynne Dittmar, Coalition for Deep Space Exploration, Washington, D.C.; Michael Gold, Space Systems Loral, Chevy Chase, Maryland; Mark N. Sirangelo, Sierra Nevada Corporation, Louisville, Colorado; and Daniel L. Dumbacher, Purdue University College of Engineering School of Aeronautics and Astronautics, West Lafayette, Indiana.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

H.R. 1289, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California;

S. 718, to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, with an amendment;

S. 815, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1007, to amend the Dayton Aviation Heritage Preservation Act of 1992 to rename a site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, with an amendment;

S. 1167, to modify the boundaries of the Pole Creek Wilderness, the Owyhee River Wilderness, and the North Fork Owyhee Wilderness and to authorize the continued use of motorized vehicles for livestock monitoring, herding, and grazing in certain wilderness areas in the State of Idaho, with an amendment;

H.R. 2288, to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia;

S. 1448, to designate the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary in the State of Oregon, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1577, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, with an amendment;

S. 1623, to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, with an amendment;

S. 1662, to include Livingston County, the city of Jonesboro in Union County, and the city of Freeport in Stephenson County, Illinois, to the Lincoln National Heritage Area;

S. 1690, to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, with an amendment;

S. 1696, to redesignate the Ocmulgee National Monument in the State of Georgia, to revise the boundary of that monument, with an amendment;

S. 1777, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain or replace certain facilities and structures for commercial recreation services at Smith Gulch in Idaho, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1930, to adjust the boundary of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park to include the Wallis House and Harriston Hill;

S. 1943, to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in the State of Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, with an amendment;

S. 2018, to convey, without consideration, the reversionary interests of the United States in and to certain non-Federal land in Glennallen, Alaska;

S. 2087, to modify the boundary of the Fort Scott National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, with an amendment;

S. 2177 and H.R. 959, bills to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House, located in Jackson, Mississippi;

S. 2223, to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, with an amendment;

S. 2309, to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish within the National Park Service the U.S. Civil Rights Network, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2360, to improve the administration of certain programs in the insular areas, with an amendment;

S. 2383, to withdraw certain Bureau of Land Management land in the State of Utah from all forms of public appropriation, to provide for the shared management of the withdrawn land by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Air Force to facilitate enhanced weapons testing and pilot training, enhance public safety, and provide for continued public access to the withdrawn land, to provide for the exchange of certain Federal land and State land, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2412, to establish the Tule Lake National Historic Site in the State of California;

S. 2524, to insure adequate use and access to the existing Bolts Ditch headgate and ditch segment within the Holy Cross Wilderness in Eagle County, Colorado, with an amendment;

H.R. 4539 and S. 2548, bills to establish the 400 Years of African-American History Commission, with an amendment;

S. 2608, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to place signage on Federal land along the trail known as the "American Discovery Trail";

S. 2616, to modify certain cost-sharing and revenue provisions relating to the Arkansas Valley Conduit, Colorado;

S. 2620, to facilitate the addition of park administration at the Coltsville National Historical Park;

S. 2805, to modify the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota, with an amendment;

S. 2839 and H.R. 3004, bills to amend the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Act to extend the authorization for the Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor Commission;

S. 2902, to provide for long-term water supplies, optimal use of existing water supply infrastructure, and protection of existing water rights, with an amendment;

S. 2954, to establish the Ste. Genevieve National Historic Site in the State of Missouri, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3020, to update the map of, and modify the acreage available for inclusion in, the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3027, to clarify the boundary of Acadia National Park, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3028, to redesignate the Olympic Wilderness as the Daniel J. Evans Wilderness;

H.R. 1475, to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund that Wall of Remembrance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 2615, to establish the Virgin Islands of the United States Centennial Commission;

H.R. 2880, to redesignate the Martin Luther King, Junior, National Historic Site in the State of Georgia;

H.R. 3620, to amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to provide access to certain vehicles serving residents of municipalities adjacent to the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area; and

H.R. 4119, to authorize the exchange of certain land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore, Jackson County, Mississippi, between the National Park Service and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, with an amendment.

MEDICARE ACCESS AND CHIP REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, focusing on ensuring successful implementation of physician payment reforms, after receiving testimony from Andy Slavitt, Acting Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Health Care concluded a hearing to examine Alzheimer's disease, focusing on the struggle for families and a looming crisis for Medicare, after receiving testimony from Ronald C. Petersen, Mayo Clinic Alzheimer's Disease Research Center, Rochester, Minnesota, on behalf of the Advisory Council on Research, Care and Services for the National Alzheimer's Project Act; Henry Paulson, University of Michigan Alzheimer's Disease Center, Ann Arbor; and Connie B. Karasow, Levittown, Pennsylvania.

U.S. POLICY OPTIONS IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy concluded a hearing to examine United States policy options in the South China Sea, after receiving testimony from Admiral Dennis C. Blair, USN (Ret.), former Commander, United States Pacific Command, Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA, and Kurt M. Campbell, former Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Center for a New American Security, both of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Sung Y. Kim, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines, Rena Bitter, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and Kamala Shirin Lakhdir, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Malaysia, all of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

ZIKA IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian

Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues concluded a hearing to examine Zika in the Western Hemisphere, focusing on risks and response, after receiving testimony from Judith G. Garber, Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Department of State; Tom Frieden, Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services; and Irene Koek, Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Global Health, United States Agency for International Development.

CAMPUS SAFETY

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine campus safety, focusing on improving prevention and response efforts, after receiving testimony from Rick Amweg, Security Risk Management Consultants, LLC, Columbus, Ohio; Elizabeth J. Allan, StopHazing.org, Orono, Maine; Melynda Huskey, Washington State University, Pullman; Wendy S. Krisak, DeSales University, Center Valley, Pennsylvania; Joseph Storch, The State University of New York, Albany; and Jane Clementi, Tyler Clementi Foundation, New York, New York.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Lucy Haeran Koh, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, who was introduced by Senators Boxer and Feinstein, Florence Y. Pan, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, who was introduced by Delegate Norton, and Danny C. Reeves, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

MEDICAL BENEFITS AND RISKS OF MARIJUANA

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism concluded a hearing to examine researching the potential medical benefits and risks of marijuana, after receiving testimony from Senators Booker and Gillibrand; Susan R.B. Weiss, Director, Division of Extramural Research, National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health, and Douglas C. Throckmorton, Deputy Director for Regulatory Programs, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration, both of the Department of Health and Human Services; Daniele Piomelli, University of California, Irvine; Stuart Gitlow, Annenberg Physician Training Program in Addictive Disease, Woonsocket, Rhode Island, on behalf of the American Society of Addiction

Medicine; and D. Linden Barber, Quarles and Brady, LLP, Indianapolis, Indiana.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 33 public bills, H.R. 5745–5778; and 9 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 144–146; and H. Res. 825–831, were introduced. **Pages H4924–26**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4927–28**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Ros-Lehtinen to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4817**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:02 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4824**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Malcolm J. Byrd, Jackson Memorial A.M.E. Zion Church, Hempstead, New York. **Page H4824**

Electing the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives: The House agreed to H. Res. 826, electing the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives. **Page H4843**

Administration of the Oath of Office to an Officer of the House: The Speaker administered the Oath of Office to Philip George Kiko of the State of Ohio to act as and to exercise the duties of Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, effective August 1, 2016. **Page H4843**

Unanimous Consent Agreement: Agreed by unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on S. 304 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule 20. **Page H4845**

Motor Vehicle Safety Whistleblower Act: The House passed S. 304, to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information, by a yea-and-nay vote of 245 yeas to 182 nays, Roll No. 443. **Pages H4844–60, H4866–68**

Rejected the Wasserman Schultz motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 182 yeas to 244 nays, Roll No. 442. **Pages H4859–60, H4866–67**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–61 shall be considered as adopted. **Page H4844**

H. Res. 822, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 764) and providing for consideration of the bill (S. 304) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 242 yeas to 185 noes, Roll No. 440, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 245 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 439. **Pages H4829–38, H4843–44**

No 2H2O from Iran Act: The House passed H.R. 5119, to prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds available to any Federal department or agency for any fiscal year to purchase or issue a license for the purchase of heavy water produced in Iran, by a yea-and-nay vote of 249 yeas to 176 nays, Roll No. 441. **Pages H4860–66**

H. Res. 819, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 4992), (H.R. 5119), and (H.R. 5631) was agreed to yesterday, July 12th.

Condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Istanbul, Turkey, on June 28, 2016, that resulted in the loss of at least 44 lives: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 823, condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Istanbul, Turkey, on June 28, 2016, that resulted in the loss of at least 44 lives. **Page H4874**

Condemning the terrorist attack on the Pulse Orlando nightclub, honoring the memory of the victims of the attack, offering condolences to and expressing support for their families and friends and all those affected, and applauding the dedication and bravery of law enforcement, emergency response, and counterterrorism officials in responding to the attack: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 827, condemning the terrorist attack on the Pulse Orlando nightclub, honoring the memory of the victims of the attack, offering condolences to and expressing support for their families and friends and all those affected, and applauding the dedication and

bravery of law enforcement, emergency response, and counterterrorism officials in responding to the attack.

Pages H4874–75

Establishing the John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass H.R. 5722, to establish the John F. Kennedy Centennial Commission.

Pages H4875–76

Motion to Fix Next Convening Time: Agreed by voice vote to the Chaffetz motion that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, July 14.

Page H4876

Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017: The House considered H.R. 5538, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017. Consideration began yesterday, July 12th.

Pages H4838–42, H4868–74, H4876–82, H4882–H4921

Agreed to:

Boustany amendment (No. 45 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that ensures that no money is permitted for the implementation of the Well Control Rule (by a recorded vote of 234 ayes to 195 noes, Roll No. 444);

Pages H4868–69

Byrne amendment (No. 50 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that prohibits funding from being used to implement, administer, or enforce the Obama administration's National Ocean Policy (by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 189 noes, Roll No. 445);

Page H4869

Goodlatte amendment (No. 57 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that prohibits the Environmental Protection Agency from using any funds to take retaliatory, or EPA described backstop actions, against any of the six states in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed in the event that a state does not meet the goals mandated by the EPA's Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 197 noes, Roll No. 446);

Pages H4869–70

Lamborn amendment (No. 67 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that prohibits the use of funds to implement or enforce the threatened species or endangered species listing of any plant or wildlife that has not undergone a periodic 5 year review as required by section (4)(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 190 noes, Roll No. 449);

Pages H4871–72

Lamborn amendment (No. 68 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that prohibits the use of funds to implement or enforce the threatened species listing of the Preble's meadow

jumping mouse (by a recorded vote of 228 ayes to 199 noes, Roll No. 450);

Pages H4872–73

Newhouse amendment (No. 73 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that prohibits the use of funds by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the Department of Interior to treat any Gray Wolf in the 48 contiguous states as an endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act after June 13, 2017 (by a recorded vote of 223 ayes to 201 noes, Roll No. 452);

Pages H4873–74

Lummis amendment (No. 77 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that removes federal protections for the New Mexico Meadow Jumping Mouse under the Endangered Species Act (ESA);

Pages H4877–78

Perry amendment (No. 81 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that ensures none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to give formal notification under, or prepare, propose, implement, administer, or enforce any rule or recommendation pursuant to, section 115 of the Clean Air Act;

Pages H4882–83

Pompeo amendment (No. 82 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits funds from being used to finalize, implement, administer or enforce EPA's proposed rule on Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Program Under the Clean Air Act;

Pages H4883–84

Calvert en bloc amendment No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in H. Rept. 114–683: Price (GA) (No. 83) that ensures none of the funds in the underlying bill will be made available to carry out any new major rule as described in subparagraph (A) of section 804(2) of title 5, United States Code; Smith (MO) (No. 86) that blocks funding from going towards environmental education grants under section 6 of the national environmental education act; Yoho (No. 107) that appropriates funds to conduct a study with existing funds on how Coastal Barrier Resource Area zones affect the value of private property; Duncan (TN) (No. 118) that provides that none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to destroy any buildings or structures on Midway Island; Westerman (No. 127) that prevents funds from being used to destroy records regarding, related to, or generated by the recently closed Inorganic Section of the USGS Energy Geochemistry Lab in Lakewood, CO, which has a 20-year track record of data manipulation; and Rohrabacher (No. 129) that prevents funds in the underlying bill from being used to take steps to significantly change operations at the Arecibo Observatory in Arecibo, Puerto Rico;

Page H4884

Westerman amendment (No. 87 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prevents funds from being used

to enforce a federal court decision that stopped implementation of the 2014 EA and take permit plan for double-crested cormorants; **Pages H4885–86**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 89 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits funds to be used to finalize, implement, or enforce new regulations on offshore Arctic energy exploration and development; **Pages H4887–88**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 91 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits funds to be used to implement a final rule by the Fish and Wildlife Service and a proposed rule from the National Park Service; **Pages H4889–90**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 93 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits funds from this Act to be used by the Department of Interior to change existing placer mining plans of operations in regard to re-vegetation; **Pages H4891–92**

Calvert en bloc amendment No. 2 consisting of the following amendments printed in H. Rept. 114–683: Blumenauer (No. 108) that increases funding for the Historic Preservation Fund by \$1,000,000 to be directed to the State historic preservation offices; reduces funding for the Department of Interior Departmental Operations by \$1,000,000; Clyburn (No. 109) that increases funds for historic preservation grants to Historically Black Colleges and Universities by \$2 million and reduces Office of the Secretary by the same amount; Cohen (No. 110) that increases the Department of the Interior's Historic Preservation Fund account by \$2M, specifically for use in awarding competitive grants to preserve the sites and stories of the Civil Rights movement; Kildee (No. 112) that provides funding to help provide fresh drinking water to communities that have been impacted by lead in their drinking water; Kildee (No. 115) that allows states with communities that have declared an emergency related to lead in drinking water to use more of their Drinking Water State Revolving Funds to address lead in drinking water public health issues; Meng (No. 117) that reduces funding for the Smithsonian Institution by \$300,000 then increases funding by the same amount to ensure that the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center receives the \$300,000 increase requested in the President's FY17 Budget; Engel (No. 121) that prohibits funds made available by this Act from being used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles unless those vehicles meet the requirements of President Obama's May 24, 2011 Executive Order on Federal Fleet Performance; Jackson Lee (No. 124) that expresses support for National Historic Areas and for continuation of national policy of preserving for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance; Jackson Lee (No. 125) that prohibits the use of funds to be used to eliminate

the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership; and Jackson Lee (No. 126) that prohibits funds to be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution; **Pages H4892–95**

Gosar amendment (No. 78 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that removes federal protections for the Mexican Wolf under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and would prevent the expansion of the species habitat outside of its historic range (by a recorded vote of 219 ayes to 203 noes, Roll No. 454); **Pages H4878–79, H4900–01**

Ratcliffe amendment (No. 84 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits funds from being used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled Clean Energy Incentive Program Design Details (by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 197 noes, Roll No. 457); **Pages H4884–85, H4902–03**

Smith (MO) amendment (No. 88 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that restricts federal agencies from using funds to pay legal fees under any lawsuit settlement regarding a case that arises under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act (by a recorded vote of 226 ayes to 202 noes, Roll No. 459); **Pages H4886–87, H4903–04**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 90 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits funds to be used to implement a final plan to designate areas of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska as wilderness (by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 191 noes, Roll No. 460); **Pages H4888–89, H4904–05**

Young (AK) amendment (No. 92 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits funds to be used to remove 3 Arctic Sales from the 2017 2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Program (by a recorded vote of 242 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 461); **Pages H4890–91, H4905**

Zeldin amendment (No. 94 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits funds from being used to designate a National Marine Monument in the EEZ via presidential proclamation (by a recorded vote of 225 ayes to 202 noes, Roll No. 462); **Pages H4895–96, H4905–06**

Higgins amendment (No. 101 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits the use of funds by a State in contravention of the Great Lakes Compact, an interstate compact ratified by Congress detailing how the States will work together to manage and protect the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin; **Pages H4911–12**

Speier amendment (No. 105 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits any funds from being made available to implement the proposed rule for dog management in the Golden Gate National Recreational Area; **Page H4914**

Chaffetz amendment (No. 111 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that increases BIA funding for dirt

school bus routes by \$1.5M. The cost is offset by decreasing EPA's Environment Programs & Management fund by \$1.75M; **Pages H4915–16**

Grayson amendment (No. 113 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that increases funding for the National Estuary Program by \$468,000; **Page H4916**

Polis amendment (No. 116 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that increases and then decreases the amount provided for Wildland Fire Management by \$2 million in order to apply additional funds to the Volunteer Fire Assistance grant program; **Page H4917**

Gosar amendment (No. 119 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits funds for the Fish and Wildlife Service to continue to prohibit tubing, waterskiing and wake boarding in an area on Lake Havasu; **Pages H4917–18**

Weber (TX) amendment (No. 120 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits the use of funds by EPA in contravention of the Clean Air Act provision requiring EPA to evaluate the impact of its actions with respect to jobs in America; and **Pages H4918–19**

Grayson amendment (No. 123 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that prohibits the government from entering into a contract with an entity that discloses, as it is required to by the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that it has been convicted of fraud or another criminal offense in the last three years in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public contract or subcontract; prohibits the government from contracting with entities that have been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes for which the liability remains unsatisfied. **Page H4920**

Rejected:

Grijalva amendment (No. 32 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that sought to strike Section 437 of the Act (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 249 noes, Roll No. 433);

Pages H4838–39

Polis amendment (No. 33 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that sought to strike section 439, regarding methane emissions (by a recorded vote of 187 ayes to 240 noes, Roll No. 434);

Pages H4839–40

Lowenthal amendment (No. 34 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that sought to allow the Interior Department to proceed with updating royalty rates and valuation for federal coal, oil, and gas by striking Section 440 (by a recorded vote of 183 ayes to 246 noes, Roll No. 435);

Page H4840

McNerney en bloc amendment that was debated on July 12th consisting of the following amendments printed in H. Rept. 114–683: McNerney (No. 35) that sought to strike section 447; McNerney (No. 36) that sought to strike section 448; McNerney (No. 37) that sought to strike section 449;

McNerney (No. 38) that sought to strike section 450; McNerney (No. 39) that sought to strike section 451; and McNerney (No. 40) that sought to strike section 452 (by a recorded vote of 181 ayes to 248 noes, Roll No. 436); **Pages H4840–41**

Grijalva amendment (No. 41 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that sought to strike section 453 (by a recorded vote of 202 ayes to 225 noes, Roll No. 437); **Pages H4841–42**

Blackburn amendment (No. 43 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that sought to impose a 1 percent across-the-board spending cut to the bill (by a recorded vote of 171 ayes to 258 noes, Roll No. 438); **Page H4842**

Graham amendment (No. 63 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that sought to ensure none of the funds made available by the Act may be used to research, investigate, or study offshore drilling in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Planning Area (by a recorded vote of 185 ayes to 243 noes, Roll No. 447); **Pages H4870–71**

King (IA) amendment (No. 64 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that sought to ensure that no funds appropriated by this Act can be used to implement, administer, or enforce Davis-Bacon prevailing rate wage requirements (by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 448); **Page H4871**

Murphy (FL) amendment (No. 72 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was debated on July 12th that sought to provide that none of the funds from this act shall be used to carry out seismic airgun testing or seismic airgun surveys in the OCS Planning Areas located within the EEZ bordering the State of Florida (by a recorded vote of 197 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 451); **Page H4873**

Palmer amendment (No. 76 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that sought to ensure that none of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Environmental Protection Agency's Criminal Enforcement Division (by a recorded vote of 195 ayes to 223 noes, Roll No. 453);

Pages H4876–77, H4899–4900

Perry amendment (No. 79 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that sought to ensure none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, administer, purchase, acquire, or operate an unmanned aircraft system owned by the Department of Interior or the Environmental Protection Agency to perform surveying, mapping, or collecting remote sensing data (by a recorded vote of 161 ayes to 262 noes, Roll No. 455); **Pages H4879–81, H4901**

Perry amendment (No. 80 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that sought to reduce Appropriations made in this Act for the Environmental Protection

Agency by 17 percent (by a recorded vote of 188 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 456);

Pages H4881–82, H4901–02

Smith (MO) amendment (No. 85 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that sought to block the use of funds to carry out the third sentence of section 107(f)(1) (CERCLA) (by a recorded vote of 170 ayes to 257 noes, Roll No. 458);

Pages H4885–4903

Beyer amendment (No. 95 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that sought to prevent funds from being used to block science-based protections for imperiled wildlife that has or may need Endangered Species Act protections (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 463);

Pages H4896–97, H4906–07

Beyer amendment (No. 96 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that sought to require that no funds made available by this Act be used in contravention of Executive Order 13653 or Executive Order 13693 (by a recorded vote of 194 ayes to 234 noes, Roll No. 464); and

Pages H4897–98, H4907

Beyer amendment (No. 97 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that sought to require that no funds made available by this Act be used to authorize, permit, or conduct geological or geophysical activities in support of oil, gas, or methane hydrate exploration and development in the Atlantic (by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 465).

Pages H4898–99, H4907–08

Withdrawn:

Polis amendment (No. 130 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have prevented funds from being used for Surgical Sterilization of Wild Horses.

Pages H4920–21

Proceedings Postponed:

Beyer amendment (No. 98 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that seeks to state none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 120, 425, 426, or 427;

Pages H4908–09

Capps amendment (No. 99 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that seeks to prohibit funds to be used to process any application for a permit to drill or a permit to modify that would authorize use of hydraulic fracturing or acid well stimulation treatment in the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf;

Pages H4909–10

Grijalva amendment (No. 100 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that seeks to prevent funds in the bill from being used to abolish law enforcement offices at the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service;

Pages H4910–11

Lowenthal amendment (No. 102 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that seeks to prevent funds from being used in contravention to a 2009 Interior Department Secretarial Order on climate change;

Pages H4912–13

Pocan amendment (No. 103 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that seeks to protect the Administration's climate change and environmental sustainability executive order to ensure that no funds be used to weaken the executive order within this Act;

Page H4913

Polis amendment (No. 104 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that seeks to prohibit use of funds to pursue any additional legal ways to transfer Federal lands to private owners in contravention of existing law;

Pages H4913–14

Tsongas amendment (No. 106 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that seeks to prevent a provision of the bill that would block BLM resource management plans from going into effect if failing to implement the plans would limit BLM's ability to meet its multiple use obligations, including providing opportunities for hunting, fishing, and outdoor recreation;

Pages H4914–15

Norcross amendment (No. 114 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that seeks to add \$15,282,000 to the Hazardous Substance Superfund; and

Pages H4916–17

Gallego amendment (No. 122 printed in H. Rept. 114–683) that seeks to prohibit funds from being used to issue grazing permits or leases in contravention of BLM regulations.

Pages H4919–20

H. Res. 820, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5538) was agreed to yesterday, July 12th.

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate and message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on pages H4829, H4866, H4868, and H4882.

Senate Message: S. 3055 was held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and twenty-nine recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4838–39, H4839–40, H4840, H4840–41, H4841–42, H4842, H4843, H4843–44, H4865–66, H4866–67, H4867–68, H4868–69, H4869, H4869–70, H4870–71, H4871, H4871–72, H4872–73, H4873, H4873–74, H4899–H4900, H4900–01, H4901, H4901–02, H4902–03, H4903, H4903–04, H4904–05, H4905, H4905–06, H4906–07, H4907, and H4907–08. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 12:08 a.m. on Thursday, July 14, 2016.

Committee Meetings

EXAMINING THE CFTC'S PROPOSED RULE: REGULATION AUTOMATED TRADING

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Examining the CFTC’s Proposed Rule: Regulation Automated Trading”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee began a markup on Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Bill for FY 2017; and Report on the Revised Interim Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY 2017.

AIR DOMINANCE AND THE CRITICAL ROLE OF FIFTH GENERATION FIGHTERS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing entitled “Air Dominance and the Critical Role of Fifth Generation Fighters”. Testimony was heard from General Herbert J. “Hawk” Carlisle, USAF, Commander, Air Combat Command.

OVERSIGHT OF THE EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the European Reassurance Initiative”. Testimony was heard from Major General David Allvin, USAF, J-5, U.S. European Command; Rachel Ellehuus, Principal Director, Europe and NATO Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense; and Tom Tyra, G-3/5/7, U.S. Army.

RESTORING THE TRUST FOR AMERICANS AT OR NEAR RETIREMENT

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Restoring the Trust for Americans at or Near Retirement”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee continued a markup on H.R. 5510, the “FTC Process and Transparency Reform Act of 2016”; H.R. 5111, the “Consumer Review Fairness Act”; H.R. 5092, the “Reinforcing American Made Products Act”; H.R. 5104, the “Better Online Ticket Sales (BOTS) Act”; H.R. 1301, the “Amateur Radio Parity Act of 2015”; H.R. 3299, the “Strengthening Public Health Emergency Response Act of 2015”; H.R. 921, the “Sports Medicine Licensure Clarity Act of 2015”; and H.R. 670, the “Special Needs Trust Fairness Act of 2015”. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 1301, H.R.

5111, H.R. 921, H.R. 670, and H.R. 3299. The following bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 5104 and H.R. 5092.

OVERSIGHT OF CERCLA IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy held a hearing entitled “Oversight of CERCLA Implementation”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Wagner; and Clay; Mathy Stanislaus, Assistant Administrator, Office of Land and Emergency Management, Environmental Protection Agency; and public witnesses.

DISRUPTER SERIES: HEALTH CARE APPS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing entitled “Disrupter Series: Health Care Apps”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HUD ACCOUNTABILITY

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “HUD Accountability”. Testimony was heard from Julián Castro, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5729, to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from issuing certain licenses in connection with the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran, to require annual reports by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Export-Import Bank on financing issues related to the sale or lease of such a commercial passenger aircraft or spare parts for such an aircraft, and for other purposes; H.R. 5711, to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing certain transactions by a U.S. financial institution in connection with the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes; and H.R. 5715, the “No Ex-Im Assistance for Terrorism Act”. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 5715, H.R. 5711, and H.R. 5729.

COUNTERING THE VIRTUAL CALIPHATE: THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S PERFORMANCE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Countering the Virtual Caliphate: The State Department’s Performance”. Testimony was heard from Richard Stengel, Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, Department of State.

TURKEY'S DEMOCRATIC DECLINE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats held a hearing

entitled “Turkey’s Democratic Decline”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE CASTRO REGIME’S ONGOING VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled “The Castro Regime’s Ongoing Violations of Civil and Political Rights”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COUNTERINTELLIGENCE AND INSIDER THREATS: HOW PREPARED IS THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY?

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence held a hearing entitled “Counterintelligence and Insider Threats: How Prepared is the Department of Homeland Security?”. Testimony was heard from Francis X. Taylor, Under Secretary, Office of Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security; Colonel Richard D. McComb, Chief Security Officer, Department of Homeland Security; and Rear Admiral Upper Half Robert Hayes, Assistant Commandant for Intelligence, U.S. Coast Guard.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 68, the “Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Reauthorization and the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Act of 2015”. H.R. 68 was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 1157, the “Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians Land Transfer Act of 2015”; H.R. 2333, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property related to the Fort Scott National Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas; H.R. 2817, the “National Historic Preservation Amendments Act of 2015”; H.R. 4576, the “Ensuring Access to Pacific Fisheries Act”; H.R. 5468, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment obligations under Repayment Contracts between the United States and the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District; H.R. 5577, the “Innovation in Offshore Leasing Act”; S. 246, the “Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act”; and S. 1579, the “Native American Tourism and Improving Visitor Experience Act”. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 1157, H.R. 2333, H.R. 2817, H.R. 4576, H.R. 5577, and S. 246. The fol-

lowing bills were ordered reported, without amendment: H.R. 5468 and S. 1579.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing on H.R. 2663, the “Public Land Renewable Energy Development Act of 2015”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT OF THE FDIC APPLICATION PROCESS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the FDIC Application Process”. Testimony was heard from Martin J. Gruenberg, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and public witnesses.

DIGITAL ACTS OF WAR: EVOLVING THE CYBERSECURITY CONVERSATION

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Information Technology; and Subcommittee on National Security, held a joint hearing entitled “Digital Acts of War: Evolving the Cybersecurity Conversation”. Testimony was heard from Aaron Hughes, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Cyber Policy, Department of Defense; Chris Painter, Coordinator for Cyber Issues, Department of State; and public witnesses.

FROM PREMIUM INCREASES TO FAILING CO-OPS: AN OBAMACARE CHECKUP

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Health Care, Benefits and Administrative Rules held a hearing entitled “From Premium Increases to Failing Co-ops: An Obamacare Checkup”. Testimony was heard from Kevin Counihan, Deputy Administrator and Director, Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and a public witness.

TBI CLAIMS: VA’S FAILURE TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE EXAMINATIONS

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a hearing entitled “TBI Claims: VA’s Failure to Provide Adequate Examinations”. Testimony was heard from Dave McLenachen, Deputy Under Secretary for Disability Assistance, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

EXPANDING U.S. DIGITAL TRADE AND ELIMINATING BARRIERS TO U.S. DIGITAL EXPORTS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade held a hearing entitled “Expanding U.S. Digital Trade and Eliminating Barriers to U.S. Digital

Exports”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5659, the “Expanding Seniors Receiving Dialysis Choice Act of 2016”; H.R. 5713, the “Sustaining Healthcare Integrity and Fair Treatment Act of 2016”; H.R. 3608, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt amounts paid for aircraft management services from the excise taxes imposed on transportation by air; and H.R. 5320, the “Social Security Must Avert Identity Loss (MAIL) Act of 2016”. H.R. 5659, H.R. 5713, H.R. 3608, and H.R. 5320 were ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 14, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine cybersecurity and United States national security, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine evaluating the financial risks of China, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider S. Res. 515, welcoming Prime Minister Lee Hsien-Loong to the United States and reaffirming Singapore’s strategic partnership with the United States, encompassing broad and robust economic, military-to-military, law enforcement, and counterterrorism cooperation, S. Res. 524, expressing the sense of the Senate on the conflict in Yemen, S. Res. 485, to encourage the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to abide by constitutional provisions regarding the holding of presidential elections in 2016, with the aim of ensuring a peaceful and orderly democratic transition of power, S. Con. Res. 41, expressing the sense of Congress on the Peshmerga of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq, S. Con. Res. 42, to express the sense of Congress regarding the safe and expeditious resettlement to Albania of all residents of Camp Liberty, S. Con. Res. 46, expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to continue to reaffirm its commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs, and the nominations of Mark Sobel, of Virginia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund, and Marie L. Yovanovitch, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Ukraine, Geoffrey R.

Pyatt, of California, to be Ambassador to Greece, Anne Hall, of Maine, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lithuania, Douglas Alan Silliman, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iraq, Peter Michael McKinley, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil, Lawrence Robert Silverman, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the State of Kuwait, and Carol Z. Perez, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chile, all of the Department of State; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the Iran nuclear agreement, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine Every Student Succeeds Act implementation, focusing on perspectives from education stakeholders on proposed regulations, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 247, to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality, S. 2763, to provide the victims of Holocaust-era persecution and their heirs a fair opportunity to recover works of art confiscated or misappropriated by the Nazis, an original bill entitled, “Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act of 2016”, and the nominations of Jennifer Klemetsrud Puhl, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, Donald C. Coggins, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, David C. Nye, to be United States District Judge for the District of Idaho, and Kathleen Marie Sweet, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of New York, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: to hold hearings to examine how venture capitalists and angel investors fund entrepreneurs and startup companies, 10 a.m., SR–428A.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, markup on Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Bill for FY 2017; and Report on the Revised Interim Suballocation of Budget Allocations for FY 2017 (continued), 9 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing entitled “Naval Dominance in Undersea Warfare”, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled “President Obama’s Nuclear Deterrent Modernization Plans and Budgets: The Military Requirements”, 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 5510, the “FTC Process and Transparency Reform Act of 2016” (continued), 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H. Res. 634, recognizing the importance of the United States-Republic of Korea-Japan trilateral relationship to counter North Korean threats and nuclear proliferation, and to ensure regional security and human rights; H. Res. 660, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to support the territorial integrity of

Georgia; H. Res. 728, Supporting human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in Cambodia; H. Res. 729, expressing support for the expeditious consideration and finalization of a new, robust, and long-term Memorandum of Understanding on military assistance to Israel between the United States Government and the Government of Israel; H. Res. 750, urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization and increase pressure on it and its members; H. Res. 780, urging respect for the constitution of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in the democratic transition of power in 2016; H. Res. 808, calling on the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to release Iranian-Americans Siamak Namazi and his father, Baquer Namazi; H. Res. 810, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the life and work of Elie Wiesel in promoting human rights, peace, and Holocaust remembrance; a resolution urging the Government of Gabon to respect democratic principles during the August 2016 presidential elections; H.R. 4481, the “Education for All Act of 2016”; H.R. 5094, the “Stability and Democracy for Ukraine Act”; H.R. 5537, the “Digital Global Access Policy Act of 2016”; and the “Caesar Syrian Civilian Protection Act of 2016”, 9 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, hearing entitled “The Strategic Importance of Building a Stronger U.S.-Caribbean Partnership”, 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled “U.S. Humanitarian Assistance to Syria: Minimizing Risks and Improving Oversight”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, markup on H. Res. 290, calling for the global repeal of blas-

phemy laws; and hearing entitled “Hope Deferred: Securing Enforcement of the Goldman Act to Return Abducted American Children”, 2 p.m., 2255 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Worldwide Threats to the Homeland: ISIS and the New Wave of Terror”, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, hearing on S. 2040, the “Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act”, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “The Status of Ivanpah and Other Federal Loan-Guaranteed Solar Energy Projects on Bureau of Land Management Lands”, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Recalcitrant Countries: Denying Visas to Countries that Refuse to Take Back their Deported Nationals”, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled “Examining Mismanagement in Office of Justice Programs Grantmaking”, 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation and Public Assets, hearing entitled “Lagging Behind: The State of High Speed Rail in the United States”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Evaluating FDIC’s Response to Major Data Breaches: Is the FDIC Safeguarding Consumers’ Banking Information?”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing entitled “Modernizing Social Security’s Information Technology Infrastructure”, 10 a.m., B-318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, July 14

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, July 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senator McConnell will be recognized to make a compound motion to go to conference on S. 2943, National Defense Authorization Act. At 11:30 a.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the compound motion to go to conference on S. 2943, Shaheen motion to instruct conferees, Sullivan motion to instruct conferees, and the motion to invoke cloture upon reconsideration on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 5293, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 5538—Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017. Consideration of H.R. 4992—United States Financial System Protection Act of 2016. Consideration of H.R. 5631—To hold Iran accountable for its state sponsorship of terrorism and other threatening activities and for its human rights abuses, and for other purposes. Consideration of the Senate Amendment to the House Amendment to S. 764—GMO Labeling Requirements.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beatty, Joyce, Ohio, E1113
 Capuano, Michael E., Mass., E1105
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1106
 Collins, Doug, Ga., E1098, E1110
 Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E1098
 Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E1111
 Courtney, Joe, Conn., E1104
 Crawford, Eric A. "Rick", Ark., E1108
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1104
 Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E1102
 Grayson, Alan, Fla., E1097, E1102, E1110

Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1100
 Hinojosa, Rubén, Tex., E1099, E1106
 King, Peter T., N.Y., E1110
 Lamborn, Doug, Colo., E1097
 Long, Billy, Mo., E1108, E1112
 Lowenthal, Alan S., Calif., E1107
 Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1101, E1106
 Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1105
 Norcross, Donald, N.J., E1098, E1111
 Olson, Pete, Tex., E1097, E1099, E1100, E1102, E1105, E1106, E1109, E1112
 Pingree, Chellie, Me., E1099
 Quigley, Mike, Ill., E1103

Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E1113
 Shimkus, John, Ill., E1101
 Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1101
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E1108
 Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1097, E1099, E1100, E1101, E1103, E1105, E1106, E1109, E1110, E1112
 Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E1100, E1103
 Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E1099, E1113
 Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E1111
 Welch, Peter, Vt., E1102, E1104
 Wilson, Joe, S.C., E1109
 Young, David, Iowa, E1097, E1098, E1100, E1102, E1103, E1105, E1106, E1109, E1111, E1112



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.