



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2016

No. 172

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

December 1, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE BOST 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.

DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, AND DELIVERY OF NEW CURES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House passed the 21st Century Cures Act with a vote of 392-26. I was proud to support the Cures Act that expedites the discovery, the development, and the delivery of new cures for illnesses and disabling conditions where none exist today. This legislation also included long overdue reforms to our Nation's mental health system.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the Cures Act additionally contains my Special Needs Trust Fairness Act language. This corrects a civil rights oversight or issue for persons living with any disability to be allowed to establish their own special needs trust. Without this legislation, the way the law exists today, a person, any person living with a label of a disability, is deemed incompetent to be able to set up and manage their own special needs trust. Their parents can do it, their grandparents, a court-appointed guardian, but they are deemed incompetent.

I want to thank my colleagues for their support, and encourage the Senate to take swift action on the Cures Act that contains all this language.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF DR. DAVID WRIGHT

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Dr. David Wright, a dedicated public servant and community leader from Clarion County, Pennsylvania, in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. He was a beloved professor and department head at Clarion University, where he passionately taught for nearly 30 years.

Dr. Wright also served in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives from 1976 to 1996. His 20-year tenure is the longest served in the State house by any Representative from Clarion County.

As a house member, Dr. Wright served as chairman on several committees and took on various leadership roles. He continually advocated for rural Pennsylvanians and authored language that created the Center for Rural Pennsylvania. He also played a major role in establishing the State System for Higher Education, which unified Pennsylvania's 14 State colleges into a comprehensive system.

Dr. Wright passed away on November 18, at the age of 80, leaving behind a legacy that will continue to benefit Pennsylvanians for generations to

come. My thoughts and prayers are with the Wright family.

RECOGNIZING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN TREE FARM SYSTEM

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 75th anniversary of the American Tree Farm System, the largest and oldest woodland certification system in the Nation.

The American Tree Farm System was founded in 1941 to protect landowners across the country and help meet the growing demand for forest products. In 1954, the Principles of the American Tree Farm System created a system for tree farm certification, establishing a clear outline for proper forest management and conservation.

Today, the American Tree Farm System is comprised of more than 70,000 individuals and families that manage more than 20.5 million acres of forest. These tree farmers benefit our Nation's forests and our economy, while providing timber, homes for wildlife, recreational space, and clean water.

In honor of its legacy, last June I introduced H. Con. Res. 144, bipartisan legislation celebrating the American Tree Farm System and recognizing the 75th anniversary.

I congratulate the members of the American Tree Farm System on this remarkable milestone and applaud their work with landowners and foresters across the United States.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD ISRAEL

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, day by day we are learning more about the future Trump administration, and as the picture becomes clearer, usually the news is troubling.

One of the most unsettling indications about the Trump administration

☐ 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.

H7061

and the Republican Party is the abandonment of a half century of bipartisan foreign policy regarding Israel and our commitment to a two-state solution.

Israel has no greater friend in the world than the United States, but one of the ways to demonstrate friendship is to be clear when your friends are making mistakes. Settlement activity by Israel on the West Bank and the renewed destruction of Palestinian homes and confiscation of property are mistakes. The overwhelming majority of Israelis still favor a two-state solution, they just despair of it being possible. The steps the Netanyahu government is taking on that path make it more remote.

Donald Trump and the Republican Party he dominated at the Republican Convention abandoned the two-state solution. For the first time in a half century, the bipartisan commitment to a two-state solution has been stripped from the Republican Party platform.

This matters.

Donald Trump has empowered two of the most extreme voices, who have emboldened and defended settlement activity and undercut the necessary two-state solution, to manage his policy advice on Israel. This should be disturbing for everyone concerned about Middle East peace.

The world is a complicated and dangerous place. There are hints that Donald Trump is starting to learn about this complexity in fits and starts. Witness his statements after visiting with President Obama and his walking back some of his most extreme and definitive campaign promises.

It is important that the reality in the Middle East catches up sooner rather than later. A prime example is the Iranian nuclear agreement, one of the few things that China, Russia, Great Britain, France, Germany, and the United States all agreed upon. It is not perfect, and there are certainly Iranian leaders who are dangerous people, but this agreement was the best alternative and the only thing that all these parties could agree upon.

Now, it is easy to talk on the campaign trail about blowing it up; it is harder to do in reality when it is actually working as it was supposed to and, in fact, is supported even by an overwhelming majority of American Jewish voters.

We all have responsibility for a thoughtful foreign policy, and Democrats must stand firm to reject some of the reckless proposals from the Trump administration; but our Republican friends in Congress should not allow a half century of bipartisan foreign policy to become a casualty of some of the most extreme voices of American and Israeli politics.

The time to speak out is now. Everyone must find their voice. Failure to support a two-state solution and reject the misguided settlement efforts which would make that solution impossible is a prescription for more pain, unrest, and violence between Israelis and Pal-

estinians. Middle East peace should not be a casualty of the American election.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN TOM LANTOS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Tom Lantos was a giant of a man, an inspiration to all of us who knew him, and greatly admired by his peers. Tom was a patriot, a recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom who championed justice, human rights, and human dignity across the globe.

Tom Lantos was a Holocaust survivor, the only Holocaust survivor ever elected to serve in this esteemed institution. Coming to America as a penniless immigrant, Tom's life story is one of perseverance and fortitude, yet, a kinder, more loving man you would not ever find.

Tom was the embodiment of the American Dream, building a wonderful life for himself, for his wife, Annette, and their two daughters. He made it his life's work to see to it that the horrors that he had seen, the horrors that he had lived through, would never be brought upon others ever again.

His background as a survivor and a Member of Congress gave him a unique opportunity to forge an ever stronger relationship between the United States and our ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel and to guarantee that the Jewish people will always have a homeland.

Now Tom's legacy and his memory are being honored on December 19 in Netanya, Israel, where a statue will be dedicated in his honor. I extend my most sincere and heartfelt words of admiration to Tom's family. I congratulate them all on this auspicious occasion.

Tom Lantos was an honorable gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and few are more deserving of such a great honor.

HONORING BROTHER KEVIN HANDIBODE, PRESIDENT OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS HIGH SCHOOL

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brother Kevin, president of Christopher Columbus High School, for his 45 years of service to this wonderful institution and for his 60th anniversary as a Marist Brother this upcoming year.

Since arriving at Christopher Columbus High School in 1966, Brother Kevin has been an all-around champion for CCHS and its students while serving in many capacities, including teacher, dean of discipline, athletic director, varsity coach for over 18 years, developmental director, and principal.

His legendary reputation has carried him through many recognitions and accolades, including the respect and admiration of his peers, his coworkers, and our loving community. In 2008, for

his distinguished service to the church and devotion to the Catholic education system, Brother Kevin was bestowed the Cross, the highest medal that can be awarded by the Pope.

So, again, Brother Kevin, congratulations on this magnificent milestone. As the heart and soul of Columbus High School, you have been a leader, you have been a role model, but, more importantly, you have given countless students the ability to pursue their dreams and reach their full potential.

Go Explorers. Go Brother Kevin.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIGHPOINT ACADEMY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great joy to recognize Highpoint Academy, a well-respected bilingual private school located in my community, on its 40th anniversary.

Since its founding in 1976, Highpoint Academy has provided generations of students with an excellent education in a positive and nurturing academic environment. This prestigious institution is a model of academic excellence, imagination, innovation, and creative thinking. I am proud that, over the last 40 years, the gifted educators at Highpoint Academy have helped develop successful students who have gone on to become leaders in our south Florida community and, indeed, throughout our Nation.

To Principal Alicia Casanova and the whole Highpoint Academy family, congratulations on this very special anniversary, and thank you for decades of outstanding educational contributions to our south Florida community.

WORLD AIDS DAY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today is a milestone in the history of the fight against AIDS because we are celebrating the 28th World AIDS Day. For sure, we must continue to build upon a bipartisan commitment to ending AIDS by the year 2030, both here in the U.S. and around the world.

I will remain deeply involved as the Republican co-chair of the Congressional HIV/AIDS Caucus because south Florida, my community, is ground zero for the next phase of the battle against HIV/AIDS.

Sadly, Florida is number one in the Nation for new HIV cases, and south Florida accounts for more than half of all new HIV cases in our State. Florida's growing struggle with HIV/AIDS mirrors a larger dynamic taking place across the South for which the region, as a whole, is not well-prepared. South Florida's issues, in particular, are exacerbated by the demographics of HIV, our magnetism as a tourist destination, and the international character of both our community and the AIDS epidemic.

Next year is a big year for the fight against HIV/AIDS. The AIDS community and the Congressional HIV/AIDS Caucus will remain committed to putting an end to AIDS by the year 2030.

□ 1015

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S LEGACY

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago, our Nation was in the midst of the Great Recession. It was the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, unprecedented in both severity and duration. It was an economic tailspin that blindsided many, devastated millions, and robbed good people of their savings, their security, and their way of life. It was a disastrous combination of irresponsible lending, overly complex derivatives, and inadequate regulatory oversight that led to a near collapse of our financial system.

Over the course of this economic catastrophe, more than 5 million Americans lost the roof over their head, and another 9 million lost the paycheck they relied on to support themselves and their families. People were terrified for their futures, and for the first time in generations, it looked as if moms and dads might have it better off than their sons and daughters.

This chaos and despair extended far beyond economics. At the end of 2008, almost 16 percent of the population was uninsured. This meant that over 50 million Americans were crossing their fingers, holding their breath, and hoping to avoid any unpredictable, unanticipated, and uncontrollable health concerns that would turn their lives upside down. Simply being a woman or having asthma was enough for insurance companies to deny you quality care, and basic preventive and primary care services were hard to come by.

Thousands of brave men and women in uniform had been killed, and scores more were wounded in a long and polarizing war in Iraq. LGBT Americans had to keep their true identities hidden. Gay men and women who served their Nation in uniform and risked their lives in defense of our freedom had to stay quiet about whom they loved, and those who were open about their sexual orientation were not allowed to join their partner in marriage if they lived in one of the 48 States that prohibited same-sex marriage.

This was the state of our Nation. This is the America that President Obama inherited on January 20, 2009.

Things look a little different today, and I know that I speak for millions of Americans who are grateful for the past 8 years fueled by real change that made our economy stronger and our society much more just.

When President Obama took his oath of office, the economy was bleeding 800,000 jobs a month. Today, we have seen record private sector job growth marked by over 15 million new jobs over the past 80 months.

At the height of the recession in 2009, unemployment hit an alarming 10 percent; but, today, the unemployment rate is below 5 percent. Today, thanks to the Dodd-Frank Act, systemic risk

in our financial system has been significantly reduced, and our largest banking institutions are more transparent and accountable than they have been in decades.

Today, marriage equality is now the law of the land in all 50 States. Today, nearly 18 million previously uninsured Americans have gained coverage under the Affordable Care Act, resulting in the lowest uninsured rate in history. Today, men and women are charged the same price for health care. Americans can access preventive care services at no cost. Preexisting conditions don't bar individuals from treatment, and young people can stay on their parents' plan until they are 26.

Today, because of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, which was the first piece of legislation signed by President Obama, women can more effectively challenge unequal pay practices.

Today, previously fraught relationships with many allied countries have been restored. Today, the combat mission in Iraq is over and tens of thousands of troops are back home with their families after years of war. Today, justice has been served, and Osama bin Laden is dead.

Today, our Nation has championed some of the most profound climate change initiatives in the world, like the Clean Power Plan and the Paris Accords, which will help protect our precious natural resources and defend our environment for generations to come.

It is up to us to decide if we want to move forward or back. Nearly a decade of progress is on the chopping block.

There is no doubt that everyone is still reeling from the long and divisive campaign season that culminated in an election that left millions of Americans scared once again.

The economic recovery and social victories we have seen during the Obama presidency have been substantial, but much more work remains to ensure that Americans have an equal opportunity to succeed; because even though today looks better than it did 8 years ago, what will tomorrow look like?

As for now, and as for me, I am proud to have served in the people's House under this President.

PAYING FOR INFRASTRUCTURE WITHOUT SOAKING THE TAXPAYER

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, President-elect Trump has many difficult tasks ahead—one of which is to promote long overdue infrastructure construction at a time when the national debt exceeds our entire economy and interest costs alone are eating us alive. Now, some have said that a rebounding economy resulting from tax reform can pay for it. Well, that may be, but it is not guaranteed, it cannot

be accurately forecasted, and we will need any new revenues to beef up our defenses and reduce our deficit—two other critical objectives of the new administration.

Others have proposed tax credits to leverage private capital for infrastructure improvements. But tax credits reduce revenue and widen the deficit. Worse, such public-private partnerships have proven a fertile breeding ground for corruption, crony capitalism, waste, and fraud; and as we learned during the Obama stimulus fiasco, massive government spending might stimulate government, but it does little to stimulate the economy when it is squandered for boondoggles like subsidizing Solyndra and paying cash for clunkers.

So how do we avoid mistakes of the past, control the deficit, protect taxpayers, and yet add \$1 trillion of new infrastructure in a way that helps the economy and not just lines the pockets of politically well-connected interests?

First, get government out of the way. Stop obstructing major infrastructure projects like the Keystone Pipeline. Keystone and many other projects like it across the country already have private capital ready to finance them. Keystone by itself would unleash an estimated \$8 billion of privately financed infrastructure construction, and when complete, would mean a half million barrels a day of Canadian crude oil entering U.S. markets.

In my district alone, one abusive official at the Sacramento office of the Army Corps of Engineers single-handedly blocked tens of millions of dollars of critical infrastructure construction desperately sought by local governments in the region. Multiply that across the country, and you can see how many infrastructure projects already are financed but cannot move forward because of Federal obstructionism.

Second, streamline radical regulations that have made many infrastructure projects cost-prohibitive. In my district, the little town of Foresthill gets its water from the Sugar Pine Reservoir, formed by a dam that has an 18-foot spillway, but no spillway gate. The town is trying to increase the reservoir's capacity by adding the missing gate. The gate will cost \$2 million, but environmental studies, environmental litigation, and U.S. Forest Service fees have inflated that cost to \$11 million. So this project has stalled. Multibillion dollar expansion of Shasta Dam is stalled for similar reasons. Once again, multiply this across the rest of the country.

Third, use revenue bonds to finance capital-intensive projects like dams and bridges. California built its iconic Golden Gate and Bay Bridges with loans from private investors—repaid by tolls that were charged only to the users of the bridges. The taxpayers were never on the hook for a dime, and the loans were paid back ahead of schedule.

The famous California State Water Project constructed 21 dams and more than 700 miles of canals. The revenue bonds and self-liquidating general obligation bonds that financed it were paid back not by general taxpayers, but by the users of the water and power.

Fourth, restore the integrity of our highway trust fund. We built the modern interstate system with the Federal excise tax paid by highway users at the gas pump. The more you drove, the more you paid for the roads you were using. But over the decades, more and more of these funds were bled away to subsidize mass transit and other purposes unrelated to highway construction. Restoring highway taxes for highways would go a long way toward addressing the maintenance and construction backlog.

Fifth, repeal the outdated Davis-Bacon Act that requires Federal projects to pay grossly inflated wages. Think tanks like The Heritage Foundation and the Competitive Enterprise Institute estimate that Davis-Bacon alone inflates total construction costs by roughly 10 percent. That means that just repealing this single act would add one new project for every 10 existing ones at no additional cost.

These are just a few of the ways that massive infrastructure projects can be financed at zero cost to general taxpayers; and because these reforms are actually directed at projects for which there is a demonstrated economic need, political favoritism and corruption inherent in government-directed programs can be greatly reduced.

Mr. Speaker, freedom works; and it is time that we put it and America back to work.

RECOGNIZING LESLIE MCGOWAN, HEROINE OF THE MONTH

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Leslie McGowan as November's Heroine of the Month.

The Hero or the Heroine of the Month is an individual in the community in the San Joaquin Valley in California who goes the extra mile to make a positive difference for the people whom I serve.

Leslie is the CEO of Livingston Community Health, a medical and dental provider with community health center locations throughout Merced County.

Leslie has been a part of the team at the Livingston health center for over 10 years, and she has been instrumental in the development of the success of the health center, which enables residents in Merced County to receive health services that would not be otherwise available.

One hundred percent of Merced County is a Health Professional Shortage Area—not enough health care. In other words, the county has a major shortage of primary care physicians.

The Livingston health center has an important role in working to fill that

gap so that no one goes untreated. Most recently, Leslie led the efforts for the opening of the Wolves Wellness Center at Livingston High School. It is the only school-based health center in Merced County. It provides medical care, counseling, and dental services to students, their families, and local residents at no or very low cost.

Additionally, Leslie has implemented programs like the Back to School Fair, Homeless Health Day, and an annual scholarship fundraiser to help ensure that people know that they have access to quality and affordable health services. This was all made available as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

Livingston Community Health and its doctors, nurses, and staff work to ensure that individuals who live in rural communities—many rural communities throughout this country, many that I represent—and throughout Merced County have access to quality, affordable health services.

As a strong supporter of community health centers, it is a pleasure to recognize and give a big thank-you to Leslie McGowan and her staff of doctors and nurses at Livingston Community Health.

WATER AND CALIFORNIA'S DROUGHT

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about water and California's ongoing drought. This week, the California Department of Water Resources announced that the 2017 initial allocation for the State Water Project is 20 percent—not good.

I join with drought-stricken communities like those in the San Joaquin Valley and California farmers, farm workers, and farm communities who are all praying that the initial water allocation of 20 percent improves when the Department of Water Resources issues a final allocation not just for the State water projects, but for the Federal water projects as well.

However, with the current operations of California's water system, it would take storms of Biblical proportions for these agencies that are served by the State and Federal Water Project to be able to increase those allocations to 100 percent.

That is why Congress must act now to pass a California water bill that will improve operations to fix our broken water system. We need legislation to provide funding to improve our water infrastructure and to move more water when larger storms make it available, as in last weekend.

California may soon face a sixth consecutive dry year. Therefore, as a result of the drought and the inadequate and broken water system, hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water have been lost, and 600,000 acres of productive farmland has, unfortunately, been left unplanted.

Some families in my district do not have reliable water to drink, to cook, or to bathe in. The drought, together with the current water policies, are devastating to the San Joaquin Valley.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to work together in these last

few days as we try to assist the people in Flint, Michigan, and to bring together a package of legislation that will end the impasse that we have had and provide water if, in fact, the good Lord sees to bringing rain and snow to the mountains this winter in California.

□ 1030

5A STATE CHAMPIONS: ELK RIVER ELKS

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Elk River High School football team on their Class 5A State Championship victory. Entering the State title game undefeated, the Elks scored an impressive 42 points and rushed for a total of 446 yards over Spring Lake Park at U.S. Bank Stadium last Saturday.

The Elks had an incredible season, averaging 45 points and 449 rushing yards per game. Every Elk deserves mention, but two in particular played a special role in their success—Nick Rice and Sam Gibas.

Rice finished the season with 2,154 rushing yards and a total of 25 touchdowns, and Gibas finished with 1,330 rushing yards and 23 touchdowns.

The Elk River football team worked hard this season under the guidance of Coach Steve Hamilton, and their efforts paid off.

Congratulations for being the 2016 Minnesota State high school football champions.

REMEMBERING A TRUE PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of St. Francis Police Chief Jake Rehling, who lost his battle with a rare form of cancer last month. What a life he lived. Jake Rehling spent his life working tirelessly to better the St. Francis community and the lives of those around him.

A native Minnesotan, Jake grew up in Onamia and attended Bethel University, where he studied criminal justice. Upon graduation, Jake joined the St. Francis Police Department where he served for 17 years. His passion for his work and the compassion he displayed to others ultimately led to his promotion to St. Francis police chief earlier this year.

Jake was committed to his family and his community. His life is the definition of public service. He will be missed.

I would like to express my sincere condolences to Jake's wife, Brooke, and son, Aiden. Please know the impact Jake had on this world will always be remembered.

REMEMBERING DR. WARREN WARWICK

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and work of Dr. Warren Warwick.

As a professor of pediatrics at the University of Minnesota, Dr. Warwick was a pioneer in the advancement of care for cystic fibrosis patients.

Early in his career, Dr. Warwick founded the University of Minnesota Cystic Fibrosis Clinic, where he served as director for nearly 40 years. Dr. Warwick was known for his compassion, kindness, ingenuity, and tireless commitment to the improvement of patient care.

Because of his work, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation patient registry was created. Before the creation of the cystic fibrosis registry, cystic fibrosis patients typically lived into their early childhood. Today, many live well beyond their 50s, thanks largely to the advancements and treatment only possible through the patient registry and Dr. Warwick's unwavering commitment to research and excellence in patient care.

In addition to serving his patients, Dr. Warwick honorably served his country for over 30 years in the United States Army Reserve Medical Corps, retiring as a colonel.

His legacy—one of a passionate pursuit of excellence and dedicating his life to helping others—will live on.

DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, growing up in Hawaii, I learned the value of caring for our home, caring for our planet, and the basic principle that we are all connected in this great chain of cause and effect.

The Dakota Access Pipeline is a threat to this great balance of life. Despite strong opposition from the Standing Rock Sioux and serious concerns raised by the EPA, the Department of the Interior, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and other Federal agencies, the Army Corps of Engineers approved permits to construct the Dakota Access Pipeline without adequately consulting the tribes and without fully evaluating the potential impacts to the neighboring tribal lands, sacred sites, and their water supply. Just one spill near the tribe's reservation could release thousands of barrels of crude oil, contaminating the tribe's drinking water.

The impact of the Dakota Access Pipeline is clear. Energy Transfer Partners, the company that is constructing the Dakota pipeline, has a history of serious pipeline explosions, which have caused injury, death, and significant property damage in the past decade. The future operator of the planned pipeline, Sunoco Logistics Partners, has had over 200 environmentally damaging oil spills in the last 6 years alone, more than any of its competitors.

Protecting our water is not a partisan political issue; it is an issue that is important to all people and all living

beings everywhere. Water is life. We cannot survive without it. Once we allow an aquifer to be polluted, there is very little that can be done about it. This is why it is essential that we prevent our water resources from being polluted in the first place.

Our Founding Fathers took great inspiration from Native American forms of governance and the democratic principles that they were founded on. Their unique form of governance was built on an agreement called the Great Law of Peace, which states that before beginning their deliberations, the council shall be obliged "to express their gratitude to their cousins and greet them, and they shall make an address and offer thanks to the Earth where men dwell, to the streams of water, the pools, the springs and the lakes, to the maize and the fruits, to the medicinal herbs and trees, to the forest trees for their usefulness . . . and to the Great Creator who dwells in the heavens above, who gives all the things useful to men, and who is the source and the ruler of health and life."

This recognition of our debt to the Creator and our responsibility to be responsible members of this great web of life was there from the beginning of western democracy.

Freedom is not a buzzword. The freedom of our Founding Fathers was not the freedom to bulldoze wherever you like.

Our freedom is a freedom of mind, a freedom of heart, a freedom to worship as we see fit, freedom from tyranny, and freedom from terror. That is the freedom this country was founded on—the freedom cultivated by America's native people and the freedom that the Standing Rock Sioux are now exercising.

This weekend, I am joining thousands of veterans from all across the country at Standing Rock to stand in solidarity with our Native American brothers and sisters. Together, we call on President Obama to immediately halt the construction of this pipeline, respect the sacred lands of the Standing Rock Sioux, and respect their right to clean water. The truth is whether it is the threat to essential water sources in this region, the lead contaminated water in Flint, Michigan, or the threat posed to a major Hawaii aquifer by the Red Hill fuel leak, each example underscores the vital importance of protecting our water resources.

We cannot undo history, but we must learn lessons from the past and carry them forward, to encourage cooperation among free people, to protect the sacred, and to care for the Earth, for our children and our children's children. What is at stake is our shared heritage of freedom and democracy and our shared future on this great Turtle Island, our United States of America.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN WILLIAM B.J. FORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of a great public servant on his retirement—Captain William B.J. Fore.

B.J., as I call him, a great friend from Caldwell County, North Carolina, has served in the Caldwell County Sheriff's Office for a number of years. Today, Mr. Speaker, I could rise and go through a litany of different positions on how he has served that great county, but it would miss the point, it would miss the point of who B.J. Fore really is.

He is a gentleman that not only do I call a friend, but he is someone who has served Caldwell County over and over again, consistently answering the call with the word "yes."

B.J. Fore has not only served the Caldwell County area in public service as a law enforcement officer, but he has consistently been someone who is always there to serve those that are in need. I remember specifically just a few years back where he and I were working together on trying to serve some of those that were in most need during an event at Halloween time. Some would come in, and there he was making sure that not only children and families were recognized for what they had or didn't have, but some of them, perhaps even that day, showed up to get the meal that only they could have provided at that particular event.

It is a heart of a big man, a big man of courage, that I recognize today on his retirement. I wish him the very heartfelt congratulations on a life that has served Caldwell County so well, and I wish him the very best in his future endeavors.

COMMERCE LEXINGTON

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Commerce Lexington, the chamber of commerce for my hometown of Lexington, Kentucky, which has been named the 2016 Chamber of the Year by the Association of Chamber of Commerce Executives.

Commerce Lexington won the large chamber category over the great cities of Brooklyn, New York; Jacksonville, Florida; and Tacoma, Washington. This award is recognition of Commerce Lexington's work to promote economic development, job creation, and overall business growth in Lexington and neighboring communities through its many programs and services.

As a member-driven organization, the award is also a reflection of Commerce Lexington's 1,700 members, as well as their volunteers and staff, ably led by CEO and President Bob Quick.

In addition to the Chamber of the Year award, Commerce Lexington also received a Grand Award in Communications for their "Here's Our Proof" marketing campaign during the 2015 Breeders' Cup World Thoroughbred Championships, which showcased central

Kentucky and the Bluegrass region as a great place to do business, as well as an ideal location for conventions and tourism. It helped, of course, that American Pharoah did what no other thoroughbred had done in history—win not only the Triple Crown, but also the Grand Slam of thoroughbred racing going wire to wire in the Breeders' Cup Classic at Keeneland Racecourse—Keeneland, of course, a key member of Commerce Lexington.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in congratulating Commerce Lexington on achieving this national honor, and for their hard work to encourage jobs and economic growth in central Kentucky and to share how special our city and our region are with the world—of course, Lexington, the world's horse capital of the world.

RECOGNIZING MASTER FIREFIGHTER MICHAEL CURRY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Master Firefighter Michael Curry, who passed away in the line of duty on Saturday, November 19, in Savannah, Georgia.

Mr. Curry's work as a firefighter allowed him to do what he loved most—help people. On his last alarm as a firefighter, he rescued seven people from the Savannah River after a ferry boarding platform collapsed. His 13 years of dedication to the Savannah community and the fire department shows in his numerous volunteer activities.

He worked as an emergency medical responder, disaster search and rescue technician, swift water rescue technician, advanced rescue diver, and was involved in groups, including the Alee Temple, the Georgia Critical Incident Stress Foundation, and was the cub master for pack number 4102.

Mr. Michael Curry is a true hero, who died in service to our community running toward an emergency while others sought out safety.

I am heartbroken by this loss. Our community is heartbroken by this loss. I encourage everyone to keep the Curry family and first responders everywhere in your thoughts and prayers.

RECOGNIZING DON LOGANA

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Don Logana, a longtime reporter in the Savannah community, who passed away on Sunday, November 20.

Mr. Logana joined the local Savannah news station, WTOC, in 2004, and quickly became an integral part of the Savannah news scene and a familiar face in our homes.

□ 1045

His career began in Syracuse, New York, as an intern, but his talent for finding a story and bringing a unique point of view allowed him to quickly rise up the ranks.

When he moved to Savannah, he became the weekday morning anchor for WTOC's "The News at Daybreak" and an investigative reporter who exposed consumer issues. A testament to his talent, Mr. Logana received multiple awards and was honored throughout his career, with the most recent being for the Best Local TV News Anchor 2016 by Connect Savannah.

In addition to his news accomplishments, Mr. Logana had a heart of gold and was constantly involved in the community. In 2011, he competed in "Dancing with Savannah Stars," raising the most money for abused and neglected children.

Mr. Logana's colleagues describe him as a trusted friend to all and someone whose bright, loving personality will be deeply missed.

Mr. Logana's loss is felt by the whole Savannah community. I encourage everyone to keep the Logana family and WTOC Savannah in their thoughts and prayers.

3RD INFANTRY DIVISION'S 99 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the U.S. Army's 3rd Infantry Division and its 99 years of service to the United States Armed Forces. The 3rd ID has been located in coastal Georgia for the past 20 years; yet its amazing history dates back to 1917.

During World War I, the 3rd Infantry Division earned the name "Rock of the Marne" by pushing the Germans back across the Marne River and stopping their march to occupy the important allied city of Paris. The 3rd ID continued to fight the Germans at the Marne even as other units retreated.

In 1943, during World War II, the 3rd ID was one of the few divisions to fight the Axis Powers on all European fronts. They fought in north Africa, Italy, France, Germany, and Austria. The 3rd ID even liberated half of French Morocco from the Nazi influence.

Since the World Wars, the 3rd ID has continued to support America's safety and freedom by fighting bravely in the Vietnam war, the Korean war, Operation Desert Storm, and the global war on terrorism.

Thank you to the 3rd ID for your courage, your sacrifice, and your commitment to our national security.

THE DEATH OF FIDEL CASTRO BRINGS AN OPPORTUNITY OF HOPE FOR CUBA

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Friday began a new era for the people of Cuba. For too long, the murderous dictatorship of Fidel Castro has reduced one of Latin America's wealthiest countries to mass poverty in order to benefit the Communist elite and the military.

A recent editorial in The Charleston Post and Courier stated: "Fidel,

though he thrived on opposing the U.S., he was long subservient to another superpower, the Soviet Union, until its welcome demise in 1991. He also was an enthusiastic proponent of the Soviets' reckless decision to put weapons of mass destruction aimed at the U.S. in his country."

President-elect Trump has correctly reviewed: "It is my hope that today marks a move away from the horrors endured for too long, and toward a future in which the wonderful Cuban people finally live in the freedom they so richly deserve."

I have been inspired by the late Louis and Nena Gonda, who fled Cuba with their three daughters as all of their property was stolen. They told me about their daughters. They were told to pack for a 2-week visit to visit a sick aunt in New York. They went to a department store there in Cuba, and they bought suitcases. When they arrived home, the secret police were already at the house. They asked them: What are you buying suitcases for? It was explained that they were buying suitcases to go visit a sick aunt in New York and that they would be returning in 2 weeks.

They just didn't have the heart to tell their children—their three young girls—that they would never return to their home, that they would never see their personal property. Their cars, the ones that now appear to be unique, are all stolen cars when you see the classic cars in Cuba. Everything that the family owned was stolen by the Communist government.

They fled to West Columbia, South Carolina, where they worked hard to achieve the American Dream of extraordinary economic success as neighbors in my home County of Lexington, South Carolina.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Help us this day to draw closer to You so that, with Your Spirit and

aware of Your presence among us, we may all face the tasks of this day.

Bless the Members of the people's House. Help them to think clearly, speak confidently, and act courageously in the belief that all noble service is based upon patience, truth, and love.

You know well the pressing issues facing our Nation. Grant our leaders, especially, the wisdom and magnanimity to do what is best; and may we all join in a common will for the benefit of all constituencies, even though this will take some sacrifice.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF KIM HOLMES OF DAYTON, OHIO

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to recognize the service of Kim Holmes as she retires from over 32 years of combined constituent services to the citizens of Ohio.

Kim Holmes joined my Dayton office in July of 2007 as a caseworker. She began working for me after the retirement of her former boss, Congressman Mike Oxley. Since 2007, Kim has helped thousands of people on my constituent services team. Those numbers increase exponentially when you factor in 23 years of service in Congressman Oxley's office.

Kim's direct, persistent, and dedicated work has helped make a difference in the lives of Ohioans in several of the counties in Ohio: Montgomery, Greene, Fayette, Allen, Auglaize, Champaign, Hancock, Hardin, Logan, Marion, Morrow, Richland, Shelby, and part of Wyandot.

Kim expeditiously resolved problems across multiple issues from veterans,

Social Security, Medicare, and immigration by developing a strong and long-lasting relationship with fellow agencies.

I made the point to stop by her office every day I saw her and thanked her for being there. In the words of her constituents, it is probably best reported as to her impact. They have said:

"I don't know what I would have done without you."

"I will never forget your kindness."

"We deeply appreciate your attention to our claim."

"We cannot express our gratitude to you enough."

"I appreciate your help more than words can express."

"There are still good people in this world who still care and want to help. You are one of those."

On behalf of your coworkers and the countless constituents you have assisted, your knowledge, compassion, and efficiency will be sorely missed. Thank you for representing my office in the highest standards. I hope that you enjoy your retirement with your grown children, Jason and Tori, as well as your grandson, Luke.

I wish you all the best.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY ATTACK

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the Ohio State University Buckeye community for its strength and resilience in response to the tragic incident when an Ohio State University student rammed his car into a crowd of students on the campus and then stabbed several of them in an attack that ended when a police officer shot and killed him.

I applaud the university president, Michael Drake, university leadership, and its incredible student alert system, along with multiagency police officials for working together to enhance the safety and security of the university. These first responders acted quickly and selflessly, including an Ohio State University police officer who, within seconds, responded to the violence, containing injuries and diffusing the situation.

I thank the medical team and staff at the Wexner Medical Center and surrounding hospitals for treating 11 patients to ensure full recovery.

As the former senior vice president of outreach and engagement at the university, I was never prouder of how we came together quickly in the face of terror. I thank all at the university for continuing to exemplify the Buckeye spirit and remaining united, even in the face of adversity.

Go Bucks.

CONGRATULATING COACH BROOKE GOOD AND THE MESSIAH COLLEGE FIELD HOCKEY TEAM

(Mr. PERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Coach Brooke Good and the Messiah College field hockey team of Pennsylvania's Fourth District on their NCAA Division III national championship.

Messiah College played through freezing temperatures, wind, and snow against Tufts University in the NCAA Division III national championship on November 20, and they came away with a 1-0 decision in penalty strokes that will go down as one of the best games in Division III field hockey history.

The Falcons are a great team with a great leader who inspired them to be their best—not only as athletes, but as women of character, determination, pride, and loyalty to each other and to their school.

We are all incredibly proud of you.

THE PUBLIC GOOD

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to acknowledge that this is World AIDS Day, and much of the success has come because of public funding. That is why I rise today, to talk about the public good and the responsibility of the President and his Cabinet members to do the public good.

I remember when President Clinton was in and generated a major surplus in our budget, 22 million jobs, pursuant to the 1997 budget. We also recognized that the next administration generated enormous tax cuts, low job creation, and a seismic debt that was created because of those tax cuts to the 1 percent.

Now, today, we have the toxicity of two billionaires who head the Treasury Department: the "King of Foreclosures," forced foreclosures, and the other who will head the no-job-creating Commerce Department by this individual.

Rather than supporting full employment or creating jobs, everything will be for the big pockets of the big corporations, not the pockets of the working families, like my constituents.

So I raise the question to Mr. Trump: Where are the appointees that are going to work for the public good? Where are the individuals that are going to have the sufficient wisdom to provide the funding that will support continued work on stifling out and snuffing out HIV/AIDS? Where are those that are going to listen to the people?

This toxic brand has to stop.

HONORING NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY CRANE

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of a premier U.S. military base

in my district, Naval Support Activity Crane.

Seventy-five years ago today, December 1, 1941, Crane Naval Installation officially opened. One week later, Pearl Harbor was bombed, and the need for an ordnance facility safe from attack on the coasts became obvious.

Today, at 100 square miles, Naval Support Activity Crane is the U.S. Navy's third largest installation in the world. The base is home to two vital tenant commands: Naval Surface Warfare Center, a center of excellence in strategic systems, electronic warfare, and expeditionary systems; and Crane Army Ammunition Activity, through which 25 percent of the Department of Defense conventional munitions passes every year.

Crane is also a regional economic powerhouse, supporting 5,000 civilian employees and contributing \$2 million a day to Indiana's economy. This critical military asset is a national treasure for research and development and an outstanding Hoosier neighbor. I proudly salute the men and women who call it home.

BUFFALO'S CENTRAL TERMINAL

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, Buffalo will select a new site for a train station in the next several months and will build a new passenger train terminal in the next 2 years. This offers an opportunity to remake Buffalo's storied Central Terminal.

Selection of the Central Terminal will be a catalyst for the redevelopment of the city's Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood, improve destination choice, and will represent the next exciting iteration of what is possible in the new Buffalo.

This is not simply about building a new train station. Selection of the Central Terminal is a bold statement of confidence and commitment by a city of limitless potential and possibility.

SARAH HUGHES' MIRACLE CURE

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I want the American people to know why I proudly voted for the 21st Century Cures Act last night—six words: Sarah Hughes and systemic juvenile idiopathic arthritis.

Sarah found out she had this autoimmune disorder when she was 11 months old. For over 20 years, she fought intense pain, fevers of 107 degrees, and getting fed through a tube for over a decade.

Her mom, Fiona, was told by her doctors that she would watch her daughter die before she turned 20 years old. Sarah proved those doctors wrong by getting stem cell therapy from Celltex

Therapeutics from my own town of Sugar Land, Texas.

Within 2 hours of her first infusion, Sarah felt a change. Here she is today. Her mom, Fiona, summed up Sarah's amazing miracle. She said: "She's her, and I'm me. We're enjoying life together, the way it should be."

REMEMBERING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF OFFICER COLLIN ROSE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay respects and remember Officer Collin Rose, who was killed in the line of duty last week in Detroit while on patrol near Wayne State University.

To the Rose family, including Collin's fiancée, Nikki, I am terribly sorry for your loss. At just 29 years old, Collin was taken from your family and this world far too soon. Our community, our State, and our country are all standing with you during this difficult time.

His fellow officers described Collin as always being kindhearted and hardworking. One officer said that Collin always had an engaging smile and generous spirit. Another officer said that he was the hardest working person he had ever met.

His grandfather, Clifford Rose, told a local news outlet that at the age of 8, Collin knew he wanted to be a police officer. As an officer at Wayne State, Collin was most passionate, though, about canines and training Clyde, his rottweiler, and Wolverine, a German shorthaired pointer. "His passion was training those dogs," said one of his fellow officers.

This is a terrible loss, and I ask all of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives present to join me in observing and honoring the memory of Collin Rose, his service, and his sacrifice.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF TUSKEGEE AIRMAN WILLIE ROGERS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of an American hero from St. Petersburg, Florida, Tuskegee Airman Willie Rogers.

Willie was the oldest remaining Tuskegee Airman from the original legendary 100th Fighter Squadron, the first African American military aviators in the history of the U.S. Armed Forces. He was a part of history, and I am saddened to hear he passed away recently at the incredible age of 101.

Willie truly represented the Greatest Generation: humble, hardworking, and dedicated to his country and his family. He fought the Axis powers and pro-

tected our freedom and our way of life, despite the disgraceful way the Tuskegee Airmen were treated.

We would not be the Nation we are today without those who served, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to sincerely thank Willie and his family again for Willie's honorable service and his unwavering love of country.

□ 1215

STOP GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on this floor many times about gun violence. This summer, many of us took to the House floor and shut this Chamber down for 26 hours, demanding that Congress do something to stop gun deaths. We almost lost a colleague, Gabby Giffords, to this violence. We stand not too far from the Gabe Zimmerman Room memorializing the brave staffer who lost his life in that Tucson shooting.

I often question if the loss of one of our own family members would be enough for us to act. Just 2 weeks ago, we learned that our esteemed colleague DANNY DAVIS' grandson, Javon Wilson, was shot and killed in Chicago. He was only 15. Javon joins the list of over 700 Chicagoans killed by guns this year.

To those Members that have offered their condolences to Congressman DAVIS, I say this: True concern and compassion requires some action. We can start with the bipartisan background check legislation. We have to start somewhere. Do something so no parent or grandparent has to feel this pain—Congressman DAVIS' pain—ever again.

POLL: MEDIA BIAS THREATENS DEMOCRACY

(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. Mr. Speaker, media bias is a direct threat to our democracy.

When the media doesn't report the facts or reports them in a biased manner, Americans can't make good decisions. If Americans can't make good decisions, our democracy is at risk.

Americans understand this. A recent USA Today/Suffolk University poll found that a majority of Americans believe the media poses a threat to our democracy. Due to its bias, particularly over the last few months, the national media has lost much of its credibility. In fact, the same poll found that less than 8 percent of voters trust the Big Three networks to provide fair and balanced coverage of the news.

Americans agree, the liberal national media is neither objective nor trustworthy.

HONORING DR. DEBRA SAUNDERS-WHITE

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of the late Dr. Debra Saunders-White, a dedicated public servant and chancellor of North Carolina Central University. A cherished friend and confidant, I have never met anyone who worked harder and who gave more.

We often worked together on legislation related to HBCUs. I could always count on her to bring pertinent issues to my attention. She remained involved, even during her illness with cancer.

Prior to joining the Eagle family, Dr. Saunders-White served as acting Assistant Secretary for the Office of Postsecondary Education in the U.S. Department of Education and in university administrations of UNC Wilmington and Hampton University.

As chancellor of North Carolina Central University, Dr. Saunders-White expanded NCCU's course curriculum, helped secure critical investments for the university, and increased graduation rates. During her first week on campus, a campus food bank was opened to serve the needs of students, faculty, and staff.

Dr. Debra Saunders-White, educator-chancellor par excellence, will be sorely missed, but her legacy will live forever.

My thoughts and prayers continue to be with the Saunders-White family, friends, and the NCC University campus.

ADVANCES IN HEALTH

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House overwhelmingly passed H.R. 34, the 21st Century Cures Act, a bill that offers help to millions of Americans whose needs have been pushed aside for far too long and marks the first step in helping improve our healthcare system, notably in mental health.

I commend my Pennsylvania colleague, Congressman TIM MURPHY, for his dedication and years of hard work on this issue. Back in my district in northern California, these failures have reached crisis levels of this system. In some areas, there are no psychiatric inpatient beds, leaving patients who are suffering to wait days, even weeks, to be seen. That could mean having to travel hundreds of miles for people who need care immediately. In other areas, there is virtually no access to psychiatric care, due to severe physician shortages.

Law enforcement struggle while responding to crisis calls due to lack of training, which has, unfortunately, re-

sulted in tragic outcomes that we see way too many times; as well as the opioid struggles, which is a big challenge for law enforcement and our prosecutors. Heroin really has had a great grip in rural areas like mine in northern California. Indeed, 1,100 overdoses in 8 years.

This bill marks a significant historic, bipartisan effort to right what is wrong with our mental health system. It not only offers solutions, but it offers hope.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to please take quick action.

WORLD AIDS DAY

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate World AIDS Day. The theme this year is "Leadership, Commitment, Impact."

First, I would like to thank Leader PELOSI for her steadfast commitment to fighting HIV and AIDS, and for guaranteeing strong United States leadership in this area. Also, to the Congressional Black Caucus for its leadership in the establishment of PEPFAR, which was a bipartisan effort that President Bush signed into law.

As the cofounder and co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional HIV/AIDS Caucus, with Congresswoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN and Congressman MCDERMOTT, we have seen significant progress that we have made in the global fight against AIDS. From PEPFAR and the Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB, and malaria, to the Ryan White Care Act and the Minority AIDS Initiative led by Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, year after year we have committed critical resources to end this disease.

Partly due to our efforts, 18.2 million people around the world are now living on antiretroviral drugs, and 37 million lives have been saved. But much work remains, which must continue to be bipartisan.

Still, stigma and discrimination prevents too many people from seeking testing and treatment. Around the world, countries criminalize LGBT people and prevent them from accessing critical HIV care. Here in the United States, we preserve stigma through outdated, unscientific laws that criminalize HIV in over 30 States.

We must end these laws and repeal the discrimination laws against people.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 1, 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 December 1, 2016, at 11:49 a.m.:

That the Senate has made a technical correction to the engrossment of the Senate amendments to the House Concurrent Resolution of September 29, 2016 and hereby returns to the House the papers to accompany the resolution H. Con. Res. 122.

That the Senate concur in House Amendment S. 1550.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 1, 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 December 1, 2016, at 9:12 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2971.

That the Senate passed S. 3183.

That the Senate passed S. 3386.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5509.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 5995.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2943, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 937 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 937

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (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 for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 937 provides for consideration of the conference report for the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017. This marks the 55th consecutive year that the House and Senate are coming together to pass a bill to authorize spending and set policy for our Nation's military.

Just as important, as is the case with most of our work on the Armed Services Committee that I have the privilege to serve on, this was a bipartisan process that allowed for numerous members to have input into the final bill. That is a testament to the great work and leadership of Chairman MAC THORNBERRY, Ranking Member ADAM SMITH, our subcommittee chairmen and the entire committee staff. This is truly a professional team that puts in long hours to make this bill possible, and they deserve a lot of credit for their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I have said on this floor many times before that our military faces a serious readiness crisis. Budget cuts have really thinned out our military and hurt our ability to train and prepare for conflict.

One of the most startling examples of this readiness crisis is the fact that some of our marines have been forced to get parts for their F-18s off of planes in a museum. That is simply absurd and it is deeply troubling.

Just as bad, less than one-third of Army forces are at acceptable readiness levels for ground combat and our pilots are getting less training than many of our adversaries.

Thankfully, this NDAA stops the drawdown of the military and authorizes critical funding for the operation and maintenance of our military. The bill authorizes important funding for training, helps rebuild outdated infrastructure, and ensures our military men and women have the munitions they need for ongoing operations.

The bill also provides for a 2.1 percent pay increase for our military. This is the largest pay raise for our troops in 6 years, and it is especially important for our military families.

Additionally, the bill supports our Nation's military operations around the globe. As we fight the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria and continue to have a presence in Afghanistan, it is vital that our military has the tools they need to carry out their mission and defeat radical Islamic terrorism.

Just as important, this NDAA provides for a continued military presence

in Europe to support our allies and deter Russian aggression, as well as resources to support U.S. operations in the ever-important Pacific.

Finally, the NDAA includes some important reforms to make our military and the Pentagon more effective and more efficient. This includes updates to the Goldwater-Nichols Act to improve the overall organizational structure at the Pentagon and throughout our military.

The bill builds upon recent reforms to the Pentagon's acquisition programs to cut down on red tape and spur innovation and research.

It also updates the Uniform Code of Military Justice to promote accountability within our military.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, but it alone will not be enough to fully turn the tide back in favor of the fully trained, fully capable, and fully equipped military that we need.

Congress and the incoming President must act early next year on a funding bill to fully fund our military, and we need to go above even what is included in this bill. As Chairman THORNBERRY has indicated, we need to push for a defense supplemental that includes important military programs that were, unfortunately, left out of this final bill.

I look forward to working with Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, the Appropriations Committee, and the incoming administration to get this funding bill taken care of as soon as possible next year because, without supplemental funding, we will leave the job half done.

While this is just one step in ensuring our military is ready for the fight, it is an important one nonetheless; so I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this truly bipartisan legislation. For the 55th consecutive year, let's send a message to our service-members that supporting the United States military isn't a Republican goal or a Democrat goal—it is an American goal. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 937 and the underlying bill.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), and the honorable ranking member, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), for their service and for concluding work on this conference report, which authorizes resources for our uniformed men and women, civilian defense workforce, our veterans and their families.

The defense bill is one of the most complex bills that comes each year before Congress for consideration and action, and I know the hours'—and the weeks'—and the months'—worth of work that goes into these negotiations by staff and Members. It is also, in general, a bill that receives broad bipartisan support, which is a reflection of the leadership, character, and abilities of the chairman, of the ranking member, and of their staffs.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal to support in this conference report and some provisions that continue to raise concern. Some items that were of grave concern have been dropped from the final conference report, like the fiscal cliff, language that would have authorized discrimination by Federal contractors, and some anti-environment riders.

I am very upset, however, that, for the second year in a row, the House caved to unreasonable Senate demands to drop the House-passed provision to honor our Atomic Veterans with a simple service medal. These uniformed men and women literally gave their lives in service to our country. In many cases, totally unprotected, they were exposed to extreme levels of radiation during the post-World War II era and the subsequent cold war period. Because they signed secrecy oaths, they could not even inform their doctors that their many illnesses might be related to radiation exposure.

They never complained, and they did their duty. Their heroism and their service have been publicly recognized by Presidents George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton. All we are seeking is for them to receive a simple service medal. More than three out of every four of these veterans have already passed away unrecognized for their service; yet the Senate—and Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman JOHN MCCAIN and a handful of Pentagon bureaucrats in particular—seems to think it is a major scandal to provide them with a service medal. My meetings with some at the Pentagon have been particularly troubling because of what I have perceived to be their total lack of sensitivity and their total lack of appreciation for the service that these veterans have provided to our country.

These men and women deserve better from their government. I hope, next year, when the House, once again, includes this bipartisan measure in the defense bill, that it won't be so weakened as to cave for a third time before such unreasonable intransigence.

This conference report, like its most recent predecessors, continues to authorize billions of dollars for our wars against the Islamic State in Syria, Iraq, and elsewhere without any debate on an Authorization for Use of Military Force in those countries and elsewhere.

I hope that one of Speaker RYAN's priorities during the first week of January will be to meet with President-elect Trump and work out a timeline for when Mr. Trump will send an

AUMF to Congress on these wars and when the House will finally fulfill its constitutional duty to debate and vote on this matter. For over 2½ years, this House has failed, time and time again, to take up this serious debate even after President Obama sent an AUMF to Capitol Hill for action.

Enough is enough. With a Republican in the White House, I hope the Republican-controlled Congress will finally do its duty. The cowardice of the 113th and 114th Congresses must not be allowed to extend into and infect the 115th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one more thing about the NDAA conference report.

This conference report includes a very important title that incorporates the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act. As many of my colleagues know, this is a bipartisan measure, championed and introduced in the House by my friend and colleague, Congressman CHRIS SMITH; me; and by BEN CARDIN in the United States Senate.

The Global Magnitsky Act builds on the seminal Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act, which is legislation that I authored that focused on Russia, which was approved by Congress and signed into law in 2012. That law targets individual Russian officials who are accountable for the death of Russian lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, as well as other Russian officials engaged in corruption, human rights abuses, or who seek to undermine the rule of law. It denies them visas to the United States and freezes their assets in the United States.

The Global Magnitsky Act will extend the use of those same targeted sanctions to all countries, not just to Russia. It will ensure that visiting the United States and having access to our financial system, including to U.S. dollars, are privileges that should not be granted to those officials who violate basic human rights and the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, as we enter the uncharted territory of a Trump administration, it is critical that Congress maintain its bipartisan leadership and support for human rights. It is critical that Congress continue to hold accountable the Russian Government and government officials around the world who engage in corruption, human rights abuses, and who flout the rule of law.

During the long campaign, two words I never heard Mr. Trump utter were “human rights.” Quite frankly, I was disturbed by his public admiration of Russian strongman Vladimir Putin, whose government has jailed and even killed human rights defenders and political opponents.

Mr. Speaker, in past years, I have often voted against the final passage of the NDAA conference report. In general, I can't vote for a bill that provides tens of billions of dollars for wars that Congress refuses to debate and authorize. I can't vote for a bill that ties

the hands of a President—any President—to shut down the prison at the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay. I can't support a bloated budget that fails to make hard choices, that provides the Pentagon with even more money than it asks for, and that continues to increase in size—without end—for the foreseeable future.

However, because of the inclusion of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, this year, I will vote in support of the FY 2017 NDAA conference report. The Global Magnitsky Act will give Congress a tool with which to hold accountable human rights abusers even if our new President ends up turning a blind eye. This language in this authorization bill is important because it sends a signal—no matter what our next President believes on the issue of human rights—that, in this Congress, in a bipartisan way, we believe that, if the United States of America stands for anything, it needs to stand out loud and four-square for human rights.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the conference report notwithstanding the many reservations we may have.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee and a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding. Frankly, I thank him for the wonderful work he provided as a member of the Armed Services Committee to bring this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to quickly associate myself with my friend from Massachusetts' remarks about the authorization. I think he is absolutely right on that issue—we have worked together on that—and it is something that ought to happen. It is an institutional question of whether or not we retain our war-making authority, and he has done admirable work in that area.

The bill, itself, which I support—and, of course, the rule and the underlying legislation—is a very important piece of legislation.

I commend our friends on the Armed Services Committee for working in a bipartisan fashion, first, to make sure they stop the erosion of the end strength of the military. It is an absolutely critical thing to do. It could not have happened had they not worked together and made some tough decisions.

Second, I want to point out all of the reforms in this legislation—procurement reforms, in particular. They have gone well beyond simply appropriating money for the military as they have done some important work to put important tools in our hands that, I think in going forward, will save billions of dollars.

I also commend them for fully funding a pay raise for the men and women

in uniform. That is an important thing. The amount of money—a 2.1 percent increase—is relatively modest but appropriate. The more important thing is the signal it sends to the men and women who put themselves between us and harm's way, and I thank the gentleman for his role in that.

Finally, I want to pick up on one of the points that my friend from Alabama made that I couldn't agree with more. As important and as good as this legislation is, if we do not marry it with the money that it takes to actually implement it, we are making the mistake of a lifetime. In my opinion, we could do that, literally, this year if we were to do an omnibus; but if we fail to do that and if we do a CR, my friend is exactly right in that we should act as rapidly as possible in January to make sure that we actually put the money together with the excellent authorization work that is done here. Otherwise, we simply undercut all of the good work of the Armed Services Committee.

This is something that we need to focus on. The authorization is important, but if we don't appropriate the money, a lot of the hard work that was done on the Armed Services Committee will be for naught, and it will be for naught until we actually make that decision. We shouldn't wait until the end of April or the end of May. We ought to get it done as quickly as we can. I would like to get it done before we go home, but if we can't do that, we certainly ought to get it done as quickly as we can when we get back.

With all of that aside, again, I congratulate both sides of the aisle. This is a model of bipartisanship. My friend from Massachusetts mentioned some other measures in here with regard to Russia that, I think, are absolutely also appropriate, and I applaud their inclusion.

I urge every Member to support the rule and, certainly, to vote for the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I support the defense authorization bill. Our men and women in uniform are the greatest fighting force in the world, and they deserve our unwavering support. I thank Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH for their hard work on this year's effort, but I oppose the rule because this bill could be made better not by expanding it, but by taking out parts that don't belong there in the first place.

Year after year, Congress has placed more and more diplomatic prerogatives under the military's purview. There are 80 provisions from the House and Senate bills in the conference report that

cross into the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. As that committee's ranking member, I am grateful to my friend, Mr. SMITH of Washington, as we have worked together to improve these parts of the bill; but different agencies have different responsibilities and capabilities. That is why different committees oversee these issues.

We would never ask a group of Foreign Service Officers to carry out a targeted strike on an enemy. That is not their job. So why would we assign diplomatic functions to those who are already handling the tall order of protecting and defending us?

Take the Asia Maritime Security Initiative—a program seeking greater collaboration among our Asian partners to solve maritime disputes peacefully. This is the sort of effort that our diplomats are trained to deal with. It takes time and precision and patience to develop interest among governments and to ramp up capacity; but the Pentagon moved ahead without the State Department, and the DOD's approach was like performing surgery with a hacksaw.

The Philippines and Vietnam were slow to come on board. That is where, I believe, careful diplomacy would have paid off. Instead, the DOD threw money at the problem. The Philippines didn't want the money, and they weren't ready to absorb it; so the effort fell apart. Now, in a difficult time in American-Philippines relations, we have a gaping hole in our maritime security strategy. This should be a lesson learned, but, instead, this bill will put even more diplomatic responsibility in military hands.

For instance, the bill diverts Defense Department dollars to the Global Engagement Center, the GEC. It is a State Department program that is focused on countering violent extremist propaganda overseas. The goal of this provision is worthwhile, but the way it is written ignores overwhelming advice from experts in the field and from our public diplomacy officials who are already hard at work in Foggy Bottom. Instead of building on what we already know from years of countering propaganda, it says that the DOD should decide how much money to give a State Department program. Mr. Speaker, that is just bad policy, and that example just scratches the surface.

□ 1245

So I support the underlying bill because it is good for our military, but I don't support this rule. I did not sign the conference report because I have deep concerns that the line between our military and diplomatic efforts is blurring. We will be back here in a year, and I hope at that time we will pass a defense authorization that deals just with defense.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I am going to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. And if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation authored by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), who has been a leader on this issue, that would require Presidential nominees to disclose 3 years of their tax returns.

Mr. Speaker, tax returns provide the public with vital information about our Presidential candidates. Have they paid taxes at all? Do they keep money offshore? Or have they taken advantage of tax loopholes? This is important information that voters have a right to know. The American people should expect candidates running for President to be open and transparent about their tax returns, and this legislation would ensure that transparency. It is hard for me to believe that giving the people the right to know about a Presidential candidate's financial dealings is controversial. I hope that this isn't.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge all House Members to defeat the previous question so that this bipartisan, bicameral legislation, the Presidential Tax Transparency Act, can be made in order for immediate floor debate and a vote.

Now, the legislation is really very simple. It requires Presidential nominees of major political parties to file 3 previous years of their Federal tax returns with the Federal Election Commission. Now, tax returns contain vital information. We all know that. But it is also vital for the public, for voters, to consider. They should be able to know whether a candidate has paid taxes, if they have paid any taxes, how much they have paid, whether they have made charitable contributions and to whom, and whether they took advantage of tax loopholes or offshore tax shelters.

This election year, we experienced a bipartisan problem in this area. For the first time since 1976, Mr. Trump, who is now the President-elect, would not release any tax returns to the public whatsoever. And on the Democratic side, Senator SANDERS only disclosed a summary of 1 year of his tax returns. I think that these are areas that demonstrate themselves to fall far short of what the American people deserve in terms of transparency. So this legislation ensures that the custom of disclosing—and it has been a custom since 1976—that they disclose multiple years

of tax returns and that it be required by Federal law for future Presidential candidates to do so.

Former Presidential candidate Mitt Romney stated earlier this year that: "Tax returns provide the public with its sole confirmation of the veracity of a candidate's representations regarding charities, priorities, wealth, tax conformance, and conflicts of interest."

One of the Republican cosponsors of my bill, Congressman MARK SANFORD, wrote in *The New York Times* in August: "The Presidency is the most powerful political position on Earth, and the idea of enabling the voter the chance to see how a candidate has handled his or her finances is a central part of making sure the right person gets the job."

So I rise today because I believe Congress should write this important disclosure tradition into law. I urge my colleagues to reject the previous question so we can hold an immediate vote on the Presidential Tax Transparency Act.

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

It is not unusual for me to come down here to handle pieces of legislation for the Rules Committee that pertain to our national defense and find myself in a debate about issues that have nothing to do with national defense. Whatever else you can say about the issue about the President or the President-elect providing tax returns, it has nothing to do with the defense of the United States of America. It has nothing to do with authorizing what the Army, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and the Navy need to defend this country.

So whatever may be the merits of the proposal we just heard from the gentlewoman from California, it is totally irrelevant to the piece of legislation and the resolution on the rules before this body. So I think that it is an interesting argument. Maybe there is another time to have it, but this is not that time.

We need to stay focused on what needs to be authorized to defend the United States of America, and I would urge my colleagues to reject the notion that we just heard.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me disagree with my distinguished colleague that somehow this has nothing to do with national defense. I strongly disagree with him on that. I think where a Presidential candidate or a soon-to-be President has financial dealings is related directly to our national defense. Does he have investments in Russia? Does he have investments in countries that have been hostile to human rights or to U.S. interests in various parts of the world? That is very relevant.

One of the reasons why we are utilizing this mechanism of defeating the previous question—by the way, if we defeat the previous question, we still

get to bring up the defense authorization conference report. But one of the reasons that we do it is because—the way this House operates is that, if you are in the minority, you don't get an opportunity to get any of your amendments made in order or your bills made in order, especially bills of any consequence. So that is why we are utilizing this. This is very relevant to our national defense.

As I said, I normally vote against these authorization bills because I think they are overbloated. I think there are issues concerning the fact that we spend billions of dollars on wars that we never debate or we don't properly authorize here in the Congress.

But I am voting for this one because of the Global Magnitsky legislation because of the human rights provisions. Because I don't know where the head of our next President is going to be when it comes to standing up to abuses by people like Vladimir Putin, against opposition leaders and journalists and anybody he disagrees with.

This bill is named after a guy named Sergei Magnitsky who, by the way, was an accountant in Russia who uncovered the largest corruption scandal in Russia's history. What was his reward for doing that? Putin had him put in jail. He was tortured, and he was beaten to death. You know, that is what happens in places that are run by strongmen like Vladimir Putin.

So, yeah, I would like to know whether or not our next President has investments in Russia. I think that would be very relevant to know. Quite frankly, the reason why this Magnitsky legislation is so important is it gives us a tool to pressure the next administration on the issue of human rights, and it is a signal to people like Putin and other dictators and strongmen around the world that Congress is not going to be silent in the face of human rights abuses. So I think this is all very relevant.

I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so we can do what I would think most people in this country think is noncontroversial, which is to have people running for President release their tax returns so we know. This shouldn't be a big deal. We should do it now, and we have an opportunity to do it now and still vote on this NDAA bill. I hope that we will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from 20 national organizations voicing concern about the \$3.2 billion added to the overseas contingency operations account in funds not requested by the Pentagon.

DEAR SENATOR/REPRESENTATIVE: The recently released conference report for the Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) would authorize an additional \$3.2 billion unrequested by the Pentagon, effectively exceeding the spending limits set in place previously by Congress as part of the Budget Control Act of 2011 and Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015. As organizations representing Americans across the political

spectrum, we are writing to voice our disagreement with this tactic.

The very real challenges facing our military are not the result of a lack of funds. They are the result of years of failing to make necessary, tough choices our nation's security requires. If Congress votes to simply throw additional billions of dollars at this problem by using a budgetary gimmick involving the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) account, you will do nothing to solve these problems. Rather, you will simply be guaranteeing another year of massive spending at the Pentagon. Refusing to make hard choices and trade-offs does not strengthen our security, it undermines it.

Earlier this year, many of our organizations expressed our opposition to the House Armed Services Committee's draft NDAA which included an \$18 billion gimmick to fund the OCO account above previously agreed upon levels. What was a bad idea at \$18 billion is still a bad idea at \$3.2 billion. We strongly urge you to scrap any plans to fund the OCO account above the levels set in existing law and finally pursue a path of fiscal responsibility at the Pentagon.

Sincerely,

Campaign for Liberty, Center for International Policy, Council for a Livable World, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, FreedomWorks, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Just Foreign Policy, National Priorities Project, National Taxpayers Union, Peace Action, Project on Government Oversight, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Taxpayers Protection Alliance, Taxpayers United of America, The Libertarian Institute, The London Center, United for Peace and Justice, Win Without War, Women's Action for New Directions.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, one of my many concerns about this bill—and if it wasn't for the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, I would be voting against this bill because of things like that.

Vote "no" on the previous question. Let the American people know what the financial dealings of their Presidential candidates and soon-to-be Presidents are, and then we get on to dealing with passing the National Defense Authorization Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Presidential election is over. Maybe some people would like to relitigate the results, but certainly the National Defense Authorization Act is not the place to do that. So we need to get back to the focus of what we are here about today, and that is authorizing the defense of the United States of America.

I appreciate the gentleman's support for the rule. I appreciate his support, which he says is unusual for the underlying bill. I also agree with him, as I heard the gentleman from Oklahoma agree with him, about the need for us in the future to address an authorization for the use of military force in the Middle East.

I don't know what the authorization is under law for what we are undertaking today in Yemen, what we are undertaking today in Libya, or what we are undertaking today in other countries like Somalia. I hope the new administration will take a complete

new look at that and come to us and tell us what they think a real strategy for success and victory is. Now, that is something we could all get together and authorize. This is not the piece of legislation to address it, and I appreciate the fact that my friend is willing to drop his concerns about that to support it.

We are here to do one very important thing—and it is the most important thing that the Congress does—and that is to provide for the defense of the American people, pure and simple. This rule, the underlying legislation, does that.

There is more work to be done at the beginning of next year, and I hope and am confident that there will be a real effort to come back and do that. At this point in time, it is important that we move forward with this National Defense Authorization Act for the 55th straight year.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 937 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 937 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 2. 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. 5386) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require candidates of major parties for the office of President to disclose recent tax return information. 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 5386.

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.

Mr. BYRNE. 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 pro-

ceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1300

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON H.R. 6392, SYSTEMIC RISK DESIGNATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 6392 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

SYSTEMIC RISK DESIGNATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 934, I call up the bill (H.R. 6392) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 934, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6392

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 "Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended by striking the item relating to section 113 and inserting the following:

"Sec. 113. Authority to require enhanced supervision and regulation of certain nonbank financial companies and certain bank holding companies."

SEC. 3. REVISIONS TO COUNCIL AUTHORITY.

(a) **PURPOSES AND DUTIES.**—Section 112 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5322) is amended in subsection (a)(2)(I) by inserting before the semicolon " , which have been the subject of a final determination under section 113".

(b) **BANK HOLDING COMPANY DESIGNATION.**—Section 113 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5323) is amended—

(1) by amending the heading for such section to read as follows: "**AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE ENHANCED SUPERVISION AND REGULATION OF CERTAIN NONBANK FINANCIAL COMPANIES AND CERTAIN BANK HOLDING COMPANIES**";

(2) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j), respectively;

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

"(c) **BANK HOLDING COMPANIES SUBJECT TO ENHANCED SUPERVISION AND PRUDENTIAL STANDARDS UNDER SECTION 165.**—

"(1) **DETERMINATION.**—The Council, on a nondelegable basis and by a vote of not fewer than 2/3 of the voting members then serving, including an affirmative vote by the Chairperson, may determine that a bank holding company shall be subject to enhanced supervision and prudential standards by the Board of Governors, in accordance with section 165, if the Council determines, based on the considerations in paragraph (2), that material financial distress at the bank holding company, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the activities of the bank holding company, could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States.

"(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In making a determination under paragraph (1), the Council shall use the indicator-based measurement approach established by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision to determine systemic importance, which considers—

"(A) the size of the bank holding company;

"(B) the interconnectedness of the bank holding company;

"(C) the extent of readily available substitutes or financial institution infrastructure for the services of the bank holding company;

"(D) the global cross-jurisdictional activity of the bank holding company; and

"(E) the complexity of the bank holding company.

"(3) **GSIBS DESIGNATED BY OPERATION OF LAW.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, a bank holding company that is designated, as of the date of enactment of this subsection, as a Global Systemically Important Bank by the Financial Stability Board shall be deemed to have been the subject of a final determination under paragraph (1).";

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking "subsection (a)(2) or (b)(2)" and inserting "subsection (a)(2), (b)(2), or (c)(2)"; and

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking "Subsections (d) through (h)" and inserting "Subsections (e) through (i)";

(5) in subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j)—

(A) by striking "subsections (a) and (b)" each place such term appears and inserting "subsections (a), (b), and (c)"; and

(B) by striking "nonbank financial company" each place such term appears and inserting "bank holding company for which there has been a determination under subsection (c) or nonbank financial company";

(6) in subsection (g), as so redesignated, by striking "subsection (e)" and inserting "subsection (f)";

(7) in subsection (h), as so redesignated, by striking "subsection (a), (b), or (c)" and inserting "subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d)"; and

(8) in subsection (i), as so redesignated, by striking "subsection (d)(2), (e)(3), or (f)(5)" and inserting "subsection (e)(2), (f)(3), or (g)(5)".

(c) **ENHANCED SUPERVISION.**—Section 115 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5325) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking "large, interconnected bank holding companies" and inserting "bank holding companies which have been the subject of a final determination under section 113";

(2) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking " ; or" at the end and inserting a period;

(B) by striking "the Council may" and all that follows through "differentiate" and inserting "the Council may differentiate"; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(3) in subsection (b)(3), by striking "subsections (a) and (b) of section 113" each place

such term appears and inserting “subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 113”.

(d) REPORTS.—Section 116(a) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5326(a)) is amended by striking “with total consolidated assets of \$50,000,000,000 or greater” and inserting “which has been the subject of a final determination under section 113”.

(e) MITIGATION.—Section 121 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5331) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “with total consolidated assets of \$50,000,000,000 or more” and inserting “which has been the subject of a final determination under section 113”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “subsection (a) or (b) of section 113” and inserting “subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 113”.

(f) OFFICE OF FINANCIAL RESEARCH.—Section 155 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5345) is amended in subsection (d) by striking “with total consolidated assets of 50,000,000,000 or greater” and inserting “which have been the subject of a final determination under section 113”.

SEC. 4. REVISIONS TO BOARD AUTHORITY.

(a) ACQUISITIONS.—Section 163 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5363) is amended by striking “with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000” each place such term appears and inserting “which has been the subject of a final determination under section 113”.

(b) MANAGEMENT INTERLOCKS.—Section 164 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5364) is amended by striking “with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000” and inserting “which has been the subject of a final determination under section 113”.

(c) ENHANCED SUPERVISION AND PRUDENTIAL STANDARDS.—Section 165 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5365) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000” and inserting “which have been the subject of a final determination under section 113”;

(2) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by striking “(A) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B);

(3) by striking “subsections (a) and (b) of section 113” each place such term appears and inserting “subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 113”; and

(4) in subsection (j), by striking “with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000” and inserting “which has been the subject of a final determination under section 113”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The second subsection (s) (relating to “Assessments, Fees, and Other Charges for Certain Companies”) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248) is amended—

(1) by redesignating such subsection as subsection (t); and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “having total consolidated assets of \$50,000,000,000 or more;” and inserting “which have been the subject of a final determination under section 113 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; and”;

(B) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE; RULE OF APPLICATION.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Financial Stability Oversight Council may begin proceedings with respect to a bank holding com-

pany under section 113(c)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, as added by this Act, on the date of the enactment of this Act, but may not make a final determination under such section 113(c)(1) with respect to a bank holding company before the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) IMMEDIATE APPLICATION TO LARGE BANK HOLDING COMPANIES.—During the 1-year period described under subsection (a), a bank holding company with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000 shall be deemed to have been the subject of a final determination under section 113(c)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

SEC. 6. EXISTING ASSESSMENT TERMINATION SCHEDULE.

(a) TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF EXISTING ASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each bank holding company with total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000 and which has not been the subject of a final determination under section 113 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5323) shall be subject to assessments by the Secretary of the Treasury to the same extent as a bank holding company that has been subject to such a final determination.

(2) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT OF ASSESSMENTS.—The aggregate amount collected pursuant to paragraph (1) from all bank holding companies assessed under such paragraph shall be \$115,000,000.

(3) EXPEDITED ASSESSMENTS.—If necessary, the Secretary of the Treasury shall expedite assessments made pursuant to paragraph (1) to ensure that all \$115,000,000 of assessments permitted by paragraph (2) is collected before fiscal year 2018.

(4) PAYMENT PERIOD OPTIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall offer the option of payments spread out before the end of fiscal year 2018, or shorter periods including the option of a one-time payment, at the discretion of each bank holding company paying assessments pursuant to paragraph (1).

(5) ASSESSMENTS TO BE MADE IN ADDITION TO ANY OTHER ASSESSMENTS.—The assessments collected pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be in addition to, and not as a replacement of, any assessments required under any other law.

(b) USE OF ASSESSMENTS.—Of the total amount collected pursuant to subsection (a)—

(1) \$60,000,000 shall be transferred to the Financial Stability Oversight Council to pay for any administrative costs resulting from this Act and the amendments made by this Act, of which the Financial Stability Oversight Council shall distribute \$20,000,000 to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, \$20,000,000 to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and \$20,000,000 to the general fund of the Treasury; and

(2) \$55,000,000 shall be transferred to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to pay for any resolution costs resulting from this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(c) TREATMENT UPON DETERMINATION.—A bank holding company assessed under this section shall no longer be subject to such assessments in the event it is subject to a final determination under section 113 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5323). Any prior payments made by such a banking holding company pursuant to an assessment under this section shall be nonrefundable.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—A bank holding company deemed to have been the subject of a final determination under section

113 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5323) under section 5(b) shall not be subject to assessments under subsection (a) solely by operation of section 5(b).

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 Financial Services.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114-839, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6392, the Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act, which is a very important bill cosponsored by a bipartisan group of Members of the House, the text of which was approved by our committee with a strong bipartisan support of 39-16.

I thank Chairman LUETKEMEYER, chairman of our Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, one of the key leaders on our Committee on Financial Services, for his leadership and for introducing this legislation. He has led these efforts valiantly to reform a flawed and arbitrary framework used by regulators to designate so-called systemically important financial institutions, also known as SIFIs. Designation, Mr. Speaker, anoints these institutions as too big to fail, meaning that today's SIFI designations are tomorrow's tax-funded bailouts.

It is clear that this issue has found, again, a fair amount of consensus on both sides of the aisle, and this legislation represents a very good-faith effort by the gentleman from Missouri to forge a bipartisan piece of legislation that, at the very least, at the minimum, would get rid of a totally arbitrary and static threshold currently used to designate institutions as systemically important.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for many on this floor when I say I do not believe in the SIFI architecture at all. I think it

is harmful. I think it is dangerous, and clearly it should be replaced by high levels of loss-absorbing private capital. But that is not what we are debating today.

Today in the 114th Congress, we continue to try to find a bipartisan consensus to support needed reforms; and, again, that is what this bill is: bipartisan. It recognizes that regulations should consider different components of risk and not simply a Washington one-size-fits-all definition.

The current approach—and this is very important, Mr. Speaker, as the co-author of the Dodd-Frank Act, himself, admits—is a mistake. It is a mistake because it fails to take into account differences in the various business models or systemic risk institutions pose to our financial system. In fact, it is indisputable that the asset threshold used in Dodd-Frank is not based on a logical formula, on research, or on any evidence at all. Instead, it is simply a random number picked out of thin air.

Concerns with this arbitrary number have been recognized, as I just mentioned, by none other than former Committee on Financial Services Chairman Barney Frank, himself. As I recall, he is the Frank of Dodd-Frank. In testimony before our committee, Mr. Speaker, former Chairman Frank agreed that the threshold he wrote into law was “arbitrary.” He expressed support for adjusting it. Then just last week, he stated the asset threshold was a “mistake.” I hope all Members on the other side of the aisle take careful note.

Federal Reserve Board member Dan Tarullo has also expressed skepticism, as has the Comptroller of the Currency Thomas Curry. Even the ranking member, the Democrat ranking member of the Senate Banking Committee, Senator SHERROD BROWN, has stated: “I do agree that some banks above \$50 billion should not”—not—“be regulated like Wall Street megabanks.”

So what we are trying to do here today with this bipartisan bill is trying to provide a solution to try to fix a generally recognized mistake in Dodd-Frank, and what those who oppose the bill are trying to do is to preserve that mistake in the law. Perhaps again, Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues need to be reminded that small banks on Main Street and even our regional banks did not cause the financial crisis, and arbitrarily painting big banks and small and midsized banks with exactly the same broad brush is wrong. It is bad policy, and it is bad for our economy.

So the discussion today, Mr. Speaker, should instead focus on the appropriate measure of systemic importance and the regulatory burden imposed by the so-called enhanced prudential standards once an institution has been designated. By focusing exclusively on asset size, you ignore other factors that may be more relevant in determining whether a financial institution should be subject to, again, so-called

enhanced prudential standards. Furthermore, an asset-based approach does not capture the types of risk that enhanced prudential standards are designed to mitigate in the first place.

By determining risk using activity-based standards, no matter how flawed these standards may be, our regulators would be better equipped to differentiate between stable activities and those that may pose a threat to financial stability. It would allow more precision in identifying systemic importance, while also providing flexibility for institutions engaging in more prudent lending activities.

Mr. Speaker, it is just so important that we note the effect these regulations are having today on the U.S. economy. They are harming our economy. Instead of helping to capitalize small businesses, leading to more jobs and opportunity for people who still lack both, financial institutions are, instead, having to expend capital on compliance, compliance that even the coauthor of Dodd-Frank admits is a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, regrettably, I need not remind us that we remain stuck in the slowest and weakest economic recovery since the end of World War II. The economy simply is not working for working Americans. They can't get ahead, and they fear for the future of their families. Their paychecks have remained stagnant. Their savings have declined. The American people deserve better.

I urge adoption of this measure. I thank Chairman LUETKEMEYER for his leadership in forging this bipartisan consensus solution. I urge us to correct this Dodd-Frank mistake.

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

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 29, 2016.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: I am writing concerning H.R. 6392, the “Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act of 2016.” This legislation contains provisions that fall within the Ways and Means Committee’s Rule X jurisdiction over revenue.

I appreciate your willingness to work with me on the provisions in my Committee’s jurisdiction. In order to allow H.R. 6392 to move expeditiously to the House floor, I agree not to seek a sequential referral on this bill. The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing formal action on H.R. 6392, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration

of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 29, 2016.
Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for your November 29th letter regarding H.R. 6392, the “Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act of 2016.”

I am most appreciative of your decision to forego action on H.R. 6392 so that it may move expeditiously to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving action on the bill, the Ways and Means Committee is in no way waiving its jurisdictional interest in this or similar legislation. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I shall be pleased to include your letter and this letter on H.R. 6392 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the same.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 6392. This is the first step in the Trump agenda to deregulate Wall Street, despite candidate Trump’s pledges to hold elite bankers accountable. In fact, as we debate this bill today, Trump Tower’s revolving door is spinning with Wall Street insiders.

Yes, in a skyscraper in midtown Manhattan, Trump and his transition team are plotting their agenda to weaken financial reform and bring us back to the precrisis Wild West days when banks could gamble with taxpayer money. Bank stocks are up on news of gifts to come, and newspaper headlines are already documenting Republicans’ aggressive plans.

In fact, President-elect Trump just announced that he will nominate Steven Mnuchin, a former Goldman Sachs executive who now sits on the board of the megabank CIT, to be his Treasury Secretary. Mr. Mnuchin’s bank is just one of 27 banks that stands to benefit directly from this legislation. Though CIT crashed—that is the bank—and went bankrupt during the crisis because of high-risk commercial lending and subprime loans, somehow Mr. Mnuchin still managed to sign an employment deal, handing him \$4.5 million a year in 2016. I suppose passing this legislation is just the Republican Congress’ way of giving him a signing bonus for coming into government.

We enacted the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act in response to the stunning greed and regulatory failures in our financial system; and yet, with this bill, the Republicans are displaying a staggering degree of historical amnesia.

□ 1315

This bill is the epitome of that dangerous agenda, with H.R. 6392 gutting

our banking regulators' oversight of \$4.5 trillion in banking assets, or approximately 30 percent of the industry currently subject to enhanced rules.

Make no mistake. This bill is not about helping the community banks because 99 percent of our country's community banks and credit unions are already exempt from most rules in Dodd-Frank. So I don't want anybody to come out here saying: we are helping the community banks. This has nothing to do with the community banks. This is about deregulating the big banks over \$50 billion.

It is also not about tailoring regulations for regional banks. Wall Street reform already required that, and the Federal Reserve is already taking steps to do so. No, this bill is about a wholesale regulatory exemption for just 27 of the biggest banks in America—banks with \$100 billion, \$200 billion, and even \$400 billion in assets.

Many of the types of banks that would benefit from this bill failed spectacularly during the financial crisis. In fact, large bank holding companies with more than \$50 billion in assets received twice as much bailout money per dollar than banks with less than \$50 billion in assets.

Contrary to the talking points from the other side of the aisle, these megaregional banks are not just big community banks. No, these regional banks are some of the worst players in predatory, subprime lending leading up to the financial crisis. They have preyed on minority and rural communities and have passed the buck onto taxpayers when their bets failed.

Remember Countrywide, a \$200 billion thrift? They were the number three subprime mortgage originator and number one issuer of mortgage bonds in 2006. They are a poster child of the crisis.

Remember Washington Mutual, with \$300 billion in assets, whose hometown paper, *The Seattle Times*, described as "predatory"?

Remember Wachovia, with their exotic "pick-a-payment" mortgage loans? Remember in October of 2008, when they posted a \$24 billion quarterly loss and the FDIC had to facilitate a midnight acquisition by Wells Fargo?

Remember New Century, AmeriQuest, or Option One? This bill would enable more blowups like these.

H.R. 6392 would repeal Dodd-Frank's \$50 billion threshold above which banks are subject to closer regulatory scrutiny and prevent the Federal Reserve Board from regulating these banks. Instead, it would hand over that responsibility to what is known as FSOC, the Financial Stability Oversight Council.

In order to regulate the banks, the FSOC would have to go through a Byzantine and litigious process of designation, which takes 2 to 4 years to complete. This would give them plenty of time to go back to the old ways that Dodd-Frank is trying to prevent. Even if a potential Treasury Secretary

Mnuchin decided to regulate his former employer, by the time he got around to it, the damage would likely already be done.

It is also significant to note that Republicans have repeatedly tried to dismantle the FSOC and its existing designation authority for large nonbanks. They have called the Council "unconstitutional," introduced bills to make it harder for the FSOC to do its job, and helped companies like MetLife fight its designation in court.

What is more, Chairman HENSARLING's sweeping Wall Street deregulation bill, the "Wrong Choice Act," would repeal this exact same designation authority altogether.

Why is the majority even considering this bill today when the chairman's Wall Street reform repeal package would render this bill moot? It is clear that this is just the first act in a long, dangerous play that will continue well into next year. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this harmful bill.

Mr. Speaker, as I said when I took the floor to debate this bill, this is the first act in Trump's promise that he is going to deregulate, his promise that he is going to get rid of Dodd-Frank, his promise that he is going to get rid of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and his promise that he is going to, in essence, turn all of this back over to Wall Street.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds just to say, if the ranking member believes this is the first act in getting rid of Dodd-Frank, she ain't seen nothing yet.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee, and I thank him for his leadership in helping bring this bill to the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague from Dallas for not only yielding, but I want to commend him in working with his committee, including the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), on this awesome legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the point is simple: Washington has once again gotten in the way of legitimate business and is harming the American people, the American economy, and job growth in this country by imposing unnecessary and burdensome compliance costs on medium-sized banks all across America.

Asset thresholds, regardless of how high or low, are disincentives to growth. There will always be an institution that lies somewhere that is slightly above or below some threshold, but the bottom line is that arbitrary numbers tell us very little about the risk that is actually involved. It is the risk to institutions in America that we should be talking about.

So, simply put, the SIFI designation is arbitrary. It simply subjects smaller

banks to the same standards as trillion-dollar, globally systematic organizations, which is something that would only make sense here in Washington.

The bottom line is, it is an impediment to free economic growth, and it is an impediment that is burdening not only our banks but consumers also.

I commend Congressman LUETKEMEYER for advancing this important, commonsense regulation. By the way, it has taken several years to get here.

We now understand that the American economy can move in the right direction. The American economy, with good and proper leadership, not only in Washington but by the rules and regulations that are balanced, will help United States families, small businesses, and specifically smaller banks be more competitive to offer the services that are necessary.

I commend the young chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. HENSARLING, for allowing this bill to come here today.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, Democrats, small town America, Rust Belt America, you just heard what he said. Mr. HENSARLING just said: You ain't seen nothing yet. You heard it coming out of his mouth as they stand here and defend deregulation of these big banks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate to reflect for just a moment on what the crisis was like in 2008.

In 2008, when this crisis hit and it started to blossom, started to blow up, banks would not lend to each other. The crisis was so serious that banks would not bail each other out.

We had a circumstance such that people were losing their homes. They were losing their homes because of these so-called exotic products that allowed them to buy homes that they could not afford, homes that would allow them to have a teaser rate that would coincide with a prepayment penalty such that they couldn't get out of the rate that was to follow, which was going to be higher than they can afford.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 6392, should be appropriately named the "Systemic Risk Creation Act," because that is what it does. It creates the opportunity for systemic risk to exist, and it puts us back where we were before Dodd-Frank such that these various banks and lending institutions and other institutions of great amount of finance would be in a position to fail without our having the opportunity to immediately act upon them, as was the case with AIG. There was no system in place to deal with the AIGs of the world.

Dodd-Frank allows us to do this in a systemic way, a systematic way, an orderly way. It allows us to, if we need to, wind down these huge institutions—

wind them down such that they don't create harm to the broader economy.

I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, for those who think that these are all small banks, let me just give you some indication as to how small they are. I am looking now at the top five of the 27 in question. The top five:

Number five is \$217 billion.
 Number four, \$255 billion.
 Number three, \$278 billion.
 Number two, \$350 billion.
 Number one, \$433 billion.

Only in the Congress of the United States of America would this be considered small change.

We must not allow this deregulation to take place such that we put the economic order at risk again. This bill, Dodd-Frank, when it passed, allowed us to look at the entire economic order and to determine whether or not there were institutions that were a systemic risk to the economic order. Prior to Dodd-Frank, they were all siloed. Prior to Dodd-Frank, we had long-term capital. Long-term capital was the first canary in the coal mine.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Long-term capital had its demise in 1998. It was a canary in the coal mine. Bear Stearns followed, as well as IndyMac, Countrywide, and WaMu. They followed in 2008.

We didn't have a system that allowed us to recognize these canaries in the coal mine and take affirmative action. This is what Dodd-Frank does. This is what FSOC does. And it would be a severe mistake to vote for legislation to repeal these bills. We are going to live to regret this vote. Those who vote to repeal will live to regret it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say I appreciate the passion of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and their concern for taxpayers and systemic risk. So I certainly look forward to their cosponsorship of our legislation to get rid of Dodd-Frank's taxpayer-funded bailout fund.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), a real leader on our committee and the author of H.R. 6392, the Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will consider H.R. 6392, the Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act of 2016, legislation to address an inefficient regulatory structure by accounting for actual risk, rather than asset size alone, in the designation of systemically important financial institutions, or SIFIs.

Under the current regulatory framework for the designation of SIFIs, any bank holding company with more than \$50 billion in assets is subject to enhanced regulatory supervision and special assessments. This approach fails to take into account differences in busi-

ness models or risk imposed to the financial system. It has real-world implications, too, stunting economic growth and limiting access to credit.

The risk of a traditional bank is not the same as an internationally active, complex firm. H.R. 6392 would remove the completely arbitrary approach and replace it with analysis of actual risk imposed to the financial system.

□ 1330

More specifically, my legislation would require regulators to examine not just size, but also interconnectedness, the extent of readily available substitutes, global cross-jurisdictional activity, and complexity of each bank holding company. These are metrics that are presently being used by the Financial Stability Board and the Office of Financial Research to determine what a G-SIFI is, a Globally Systemically Important Financial Institution.

This bill number may be new, but the concept is not. With the exception of the offset language contained in section 6 of this bill, H.R. 6392 is identical to H.R. 1309, which was the legislation I introduced last year that attracted broad bipartisan support and garnered 135 cosponsors.

Even Dodd-Frank's author, the former chairman of the Financial Services Committee, Barney Frank, said this issue needs to be addressed. During a November 20 radio interview, Chairman Frank said: "We put in there that banks got the extra supervision if they were \$50 billion in assets. That was a mistake."

Chairman Frank further went on to say: "When it comes to lending and job creation, the regional banks are obviously very, very important. I hope that if we get some regulatory changes, we give some regulatory relaxation to those banks."

Chairman Frank testified to that effect—and this is a picture of him in front of our committee—and expressed support for our bill back in 2014. This week we have the opportunity to remedy this oversight.

This legislation will not impact the authority of the regulatory agencies to oversee institutions. It will, however, encourage enhanced and more appropriate oversight of institutions that could actually have a greater impact on the overall economy, financial system, and, most importantly, consumers.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to take a more pragmatic approach to financial regulation. Mr. Speaker, it is time to actually manage risk and limit threats to our financial system.

I want to thank my colleagues for their work on this legislation, namely, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. HILL, and Ms. SINEMA, and ask my colleagues for their support today. And a special thanks to Chairman HENSARLING for his tireless support for efforts on this bill.

Just one moment, if I could, to address a couple of comments that were

made earlier. We are talking about systemically important financial institutions, and the definition of a SIFI is it has got to be something that is going to cause the economy to go down. A \$50 billion bank is going to be something that may be important to a local economy, but it is not going to be something important to the entire economy. This is what we are talking about.

Big banks have big problems. Medium-sized banks do not affect the systemic concern that we should have about the economy, and this is where this bill is directed. Somebody who doesn't understand that, I think they are missing the point.

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

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. So I think even the ranking member made my point a while ago when she said 27 banks, a total of \$4.6 trillion. We have got a half dozen banks over \$1 trillion, so we are talking about some small banks that are really going to have a small impact with regard to if they went down or not.

That is what the purpose of this legislation, Dodd-Frank, was about: to stop the big guys from bringing the whole economy down. The ranking member, with all due respect, misses the entire point of what Dodd-Frank is supposed to be and what the intent of this bill is.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, while the other side fights for the big banks and we over here are fighting for the consumers, let me just say that Mr. Frank has not supported H.R. 6392, and you need to stop saying that.

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have a little different take on this. I oppose this bill. In fact, I strongly oppose it, but I don't exactly oppose the idea at all. Let me explain that.

The Dodd-Frank legislation was written, as we all know, during a period of financial crisis, and legislators and regulators had to act quickly. Sometimes, when you have to act quickly, you take shortcuts to get the financial system stabilized. But today, the difference is we have the luxury of time to go back and replace those shortcuts with some more deliberative decision-making.

Now, Dodd-Frank said that every bank holding company over \$50 billion gets heightened supervision. Well, frankly, back then, for stabilizing a financial crisis, that was a great way to move quickly and to get it done and to bring about the intended result. But again, for making policy over the long term, that doesn't make sense because, in fact, it is an arbitrary-size threshold. So it was a shortcut that made sense at the time, and I join with you in supporting a reevaluation of that particular threshold level. That is the

idea of this bill, and I support the bill—or support the idea. But, again, I don't support this bill at all because, instead of taking the luxury of time to make good policy, frankly, it acts like we are still back in that crisis, and we are taking another shortcut.

The bill says FSOC should determine which banks need heightened supervision, and that is a great idea. That is what they are there for. And then it says FSOC has to complete all of its work on all of the banks within 12 months. That is a terrible idea. That is a terrible idea.

The last determination that FSOC took lasted 16 months, and they were working on one company at the time—and it took 16 months. And even then, the judge said: You took 16 months, and you acted too rashly and should have deliberated more. But this bill says only 12 months are allowed. And it is not just one company they would be looking at. It could be up to 40 companies with over \$50 billion in assets.

So I would say to my friend from Missouri, I think you have a good idea. I wish you would have brought a bill reflecting that idea out here.

Let's remember that Bear Stearns was \$400 billion; it contributed. Washington Mutual, \$300 billion; it contributed. All of those banks are going to be in one pot that have 12 months to be looked at. We are, in fact, gutting Dodd-Frank; and, no, I do not agree with my friend from Texas, the chairman, that that is a good idea at all.

The authors kind of recognized this, which is why they said banks get heightened supervision if FSOC says so or if the Financial Stability Board in Basel, Switzerland, says so. I don't know why we would cede sovereignty. I have been working with the gentleman from Missouri on exactly that issue as it relates to insurance companies. Why are we ceding our sovereignty to some regulatory entity in another country?

So I do take a different view of this bill.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I urge my colleagues to support the idea by rejecting this bill which will not achieve the intended result because it can't work. But the idea can. Go back. Put in a reasonable timeframe. Drop that crazy FSB provision, and let the regulators get to work looking for the risks that devastated the economy a decade ago so we don't have to relive that. If we pass this bill, we very well may.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) will control the remainder of the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

There was no objection.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), the chair of

the Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee, who is set to retire shortly, and whose expertise and hard work we are going to miss; but his guidance over these years has certainly given us a lesson on how to get things done. And we certainly hope that he will have a great retirement.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I thank the gentleman for those kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6392, offered by my good friend from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

H.R. 6392, known as the Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act, is bipartisan legislation that ensures that the Federal Government takes a thoughtful and comprehensive approach when evaluating the financial stability concerns posed by U.S. bank holding companies.

Under H.R. 6392, the bank holding companies will no longer be measured by their size alone when evaluated for the application of heightened prudential standards. Instead, the Financial Stability Oversight Council will use a metrics-based approach that takes into consideration the totality of the bank holding company's operations. Using this framework, bank holding companies will be measured on size, complexity, their interconnectedness, cross-jurisdictional activity, and available substitutes.

This approach is similar to the framework used by the international body known as the Financial Stability Board, which designates global systemically important banks. Further, it is the framework already being used by the Federal Reserve when it evaluates financial stability concerns stemming from bank mergers.

Mounting evidence coming from regulators and academics have highlighted the flaws in using a size-only approach to measuring systemic risk. Further, several democratically appointed regulators have noted the flaws with Dodd-Frank's threshold of \$50 billion in assets.

Put simply, many bank holding companies are being subjected to enhanced regulatory requirements for no sound policy reasons. That results in restricted lending, decreased services to customers, and inefficiencies in the marketplace.

We must strive to ensure that the government policy is thoughtful and properly calibrated. H.R. 6392 is absolutely necessary to ensure that we meet those principles.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" for H.R. 6392.

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

Mr. FOSTER. I thank Ranking Member WATERS for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6392, the Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act of 2016. Although many aspects of this bill have sound arguments behind them, it con-

tains fatal flaws which should preclude our support.

The financial crisis taught us many things about our markets and overturned some fairly fundamental assumptions that were widely held prior to it. One of the things we learned was the extent to which systemic risk could build up in a regulatory paradigm that was focused entirely on entity risk. It was quickly evident that the failure of a large institution posed a greater threat than previously believed.

At the same time the phrase "too big to fail" became public shorthand for some of these firms, economists and other experts talked about another important aspect, too interconnected to fail.

Asset size is a quick and useful metric for determining whether a firm is potentially so large that a failure could have a massive impact on systemwide stability, and evaluating the risks that single institutions can pose to the system often require a more nuanced approach.

The exposure of counterparties to a failing firm or exposures of other institutions to the same risks are systemic risk factors that should rightly be considered. Also, as the economy grows, many fixed thresholds, such as \$50 billion, will shrink in importance. At the very least, the importance given to any asset size threshold needs to be periodically reconsidered in the scope of an economic indicator like GDP. Whenever the line is drawn, it should reflect the macroeconomic factors that the bank is nested in.

Moreover, there is anecdotal evidence that firms will avoid growth—meaning, cutting back in lending—as they approach any fixed threshold. I see this as a market distortion that reflects risks of increasing concentration rather than prudent risk management. I see this concern with nearly any fixed threshold for being deemed a SIFI.

However, I think that a nuanced, weighted process that gives deference to the expertise of regulatory agencies is appropriate. Drawing lines to determine which firms warrant additional scrutiny will always be a difficult process. To the extent that the bill we consider today looks to other factors that a strong Financial Stability Oversight Council with adequate resources and leadership should consider, I believe that this is a good start.

I do think that there are improvements to be made in the designation threshold, but I think this bill has two core problems that prevent my support.

First, legislation to change the threshold should give sufficient specific direction that it would not move with changes to the political leadership of the FSOC. The concentration of an effective veto power in the hands of a single political appointee basically aggravates that concern tremendously.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FOSTER. Second, thorough analysis of the institutions presently categorized as SIFIs but not G-SIBs requires more than a year. The bill today rightly looks to characteristics that are important in assessing systemic risk, but it does not provide predictability or an adequate transition period.

The most recent financial crisis saw the failure of institutions of a variety of sizes, but, for example, the savings and loan crisis was the simultaneous failure of many smaller firms.

I support an approach that looks at many different factors and gives discretion to a strong, well-resourced FSOC to designate forms based on objective characteristics of the firm so we can prevent another crisis. However, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 6392 because it does not set up the thoughtful framework we need.

□ 1345

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining on both sides, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri has 15 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 10¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), chairman of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee. He is obviously one of the greater, deeper thinkers on our committee from the standpoint of being able to handle that sort of subcommittee. It is certainly an honor to have him with us today.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my fellow subcommittee chairman who has written a great piece of legislation here.

We all have been talking about Dodd-Frank creating this Financial Stability Oversight Council, or FSOC, which was charged with monitoring systemic risk in the U.S. financial sector and coordinating regulatory responses by its member agencies—a good goal, but an idea gone bad, unfortunately.

FSOC designates these banking companies with over \$50 billion in assets, they are automatically considered systemically important financial institutions, and the act subjects those institutions to enhanced regulatory standards.

Here is the issue, Mr. Speaker: this is not about Wall Street banks. This is really affecting and hitting Main Street banks. The SIFI designation really is arbitrary, and it subjects these companies with those assets. Which, don't get me wrong, \$50 billion is a lot of money. However, if you look at the totality of our financial institutions, it is actually quite small. It suddenly says that they are globally now systemically important that, if this particular bank or company went out of business, we could take down the whole economy. It is just ludicrous.

The process that FSOC uses to designate these institutions is flawed in its current design and lacks the transparency and accountability that the American taxpayers deserve and, frankly, expect.

In fact, the former Financial Services chairman, Barney Frank, under which Dodd-Frank is named, even agreed that the \$50 billion SIFI threshold that he wrote into law and that the Senate wrote into law was “arbitrary.” Maybe 75 was too big and 25 was too small, so they settled on 50. There is no basis as to why that number was picked. I couldn't agree more with that former chairman.

This bill, H.R. 6392, the Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act, is a bipartisan bill that passed out of our committee 39–16 with eight Democrats joining the majority, and it would require instead that FSOC use an indicator-based measurement that has five different operational indicators.

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

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Those five operational indicators are size, interconnectedness, complexity, cross-jurisdictional activity, and available substitutes. Therefore, what is happening is we are seeing fewer products and services available to bank customers because these banks are having to pour more additional resources that could go towards servicing those customers into a regulation that isn't doing anything to protect our economy.

That ultimately needs to be our goal. Our goal here needs to make sure that we restore transparency by allowing regulators to review all of the circumstances surrounding that and not have a Washington, D.C.-driven one-size-fits-all approach.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, it was just said that this is affecting Main Street. It is not. All that passion you see on the other side is about the big banks, not about community banks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and a strong advocate for the protection of Wall Street reform.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this legislation, but I also want to speak to the millions of Americans of all political stripes who want Washington to change, who want to reclaim their voice in their democracy, and who long, actually, for the interests of Main Street to be put ahead of the interests of Wall Street.

Unfortunately, Washington hasn't heard you, America. The system is still rigged and the swamp is only getting

deeper. Special interest lobbyists are sharpening their knives in advance of the new Congress, and President-elect Trump's administration is ready to carve up the Tax Code for their benefit and eliminate oversight of Wall Street.

In fact, bank stocks are surging now with Wall Street giddy at the prospect of tossing out critical rules and regulations designed to prevent another financial collapse and taxpayer bailout.

As one Wall Street analyst put it immediately after the election: “Everything is in play.”

Or maybe we should just use Mr. HENSARLING's words: “You ain't seen nothing yet.”

If you need further proof that special interests and the Wall Street elite will be empowered in the new Congress and administration, look no further than President-elect Trump's nomination for the Treasury Department: Steve Mnuchin—a billionaire hedge fund manager, former Goldman Sachs executive and bank CEO. President-elect Trump, a supposed champion of the working class, now seeks to appoint a financier who, like Trump, personally profited on the financial ruin of hard-working Americans.

What does this have to do with the bill we have before us, you may ask?

Well, a lot. Today, before the new President is even seated and Steven Mnuchin is even confirmed, H.R. 6392 will dramatically upend sensible oversight of some of the Nation's largest banks, many of which were directly implicated in the financial collapse of 2008.

Taxpayers lose under this legislation, but guess who stands to benefit from it?

Steve Mnuchin. He serves on the board of the bank CIT, receiving a salary of \$4.5 million. CIT is one of only 27 banks in the country that will benefit from this terrible legislation. What is more, under this legislation, Mnuchin, if confirmed, will be in charge of overseeing the replacement designation process for CIT and the other 26 large regional banks rewarded by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation and the nomination of Steve Mnuchin is a direct rebuke of President-elect Trump's promise to “drain the swamp.” The only thing cleaner about the swamp is that the alligators will be wearing suits and ties.

Millions of Americans of all political stripes are hurting. They want a more representative democracy. They want public policy designed for the public interest, not the special interests. They want a fair shake. Let's show them we are still fighting for them. Let's defeat this Wall Street giveaway.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), who is the chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee. He is one of our toughest guys on the committee. He has got one of the toughest committees to be able to go after some of the issues that we are working on.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman LUETKEMEYER for all his hard work on what I think is an excellent bill. It is fascinating to sit in this Chamber and listen to the debate and the fear-mongering that takes place.

Before I get into that, let's just take a trip down memory lane. We have to look at the financial crisis and what the Democrats chose to do, the idea that you can't let any good crisis go to waste. There is a financial crisis, so we go to our file cabinets, we open them up, and every progressive, liberal idea we take out and put them into Dodd-Frank—a 2,300-page bill, a bill that was written before the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission even came out with their report on the cause of the crisis.

This is a very, very simple tweak. Right now we have designations for systemically risky banks at a set assets threshold of \$50 billion. Let me tell you what, I have banks in Wisconsin. They are small, regional banks—not Wall Street banks—that are getting crushed by these new rules and regulations.

So all we are saying to my friends across the aisle is: You love the regulators. You think that the regulators are awesome.

We are trying to empower the regulators to look at the facts on the ground and to look at the interconnectedness and complexity to determine risk, not just have a one-size-fits-all mentality. It is not one size fits all. We are more complex. Banks are as different as people.

Let's look at the complexity at every bank and make sure they can operate within their communities in a way that fits the risk to the financial system.

This gets back to the American people. Why does this matter? Why is this not just about finance and complex rules?

Because if banks can't lend, or if they lend and you are driving up the cost of their lending, then that has a real impact on the small businesses in my community and the families in my community that can't get a loan, or the loans they do get, the costs are going through the roof because of all the new compliance costs.

The bottom line is why do we want to have increased regulatory burdens on banks that aren't risky?

Let's have the regulators focus like a laser on the banks on Wall Street who do need the increased regulation, but not the ones that don't.

One size doesn't fit all. Let's work together. Let's modify Dodd-Frank. This isn't Holy Scripture. It didn't come down from Heaven on high. It can be fixed. It is not perfect. Again—we are going to say this all day—Barney Frank even thinks the threshold is too low. It can be fixed.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my good friend,

the ranking member. Commonsense reform that looks to your good friends, the regulators, to take a sound look at risk profiles, and then decide what kind of regulatory regime is necessary for the risk that is presented by each of these banks.

I thank the chairman for his work. I encourage everyone on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense bill that supports small businesses and American families to make America great again.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin has the audacity to come to this floor and say that we are crushing these pitiful little banks with \$50 billion or more. No. You are crushing the average person who gets up every morning, who goes to work, and who is trying to take care of their families and is getting ripped off by these financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD), who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today in strong opposition to H.R. 6392. It is a dangerous bill that puts the economic security of millions of Americans at risk.

Let's not forget that just 8 short years ago, the lives of Americans all across the country were shaken and devastated by the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. The livelihoods of hardworking families were put at risk and millions of Americans lost their homes and saw their lifesavings wiped out all because of risky banking practices and the overgrown "too big to fail" banks. At that time, Republicans and Democrats railed against the travesty that these banks exacted on the American people.

This bill threatens to unravel the very protections that were put in place to prevent a repeat of this economic crisis. It would gut the higher capital requirements on 27 banks that together hold over \$4 trillion in assets—nearly one-quarter of all banking system assets in the United States—and water down the independent authority of the Federal Reserve to regulate large bank risk.

Eight years ago, the failure of large regional banks like Countrywide, Washington Mutual, and Wachovia—major subprime mortgage lenders leading up to the crisis—created shock waves throughout our financial system and hurt the American people. This bill would scale back the Federal Reserve's ability to regulate these banks, placing greater risk and burden on the backs of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the people and vote against this dangerous legislation.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who is one of our bright and shining stars on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6392, the Sys-

temic Risk Designation Improvement Act, and I applaud the gentleman's excellent work on this bill.

The ranking member, my friend, says that this is not about Main Street. Let me talk about what this bill is trying to fix, the problem we are trying to solve here.

Dodd-Frank, the legislation that my friends on the other side of the aisle are defending, has produced this: small-business lending from banks is at the lowest level it has been in 20 years, and more than 75 percent of corporate treasurers in this country say that Federal regulations are stifling access to financial services. As a result, new business formation in this country is at a 35-year low.

This bill is about Main Street because Main Street cannot access financial services because of Dodd-Frank. This bill is about fixing an arbitrary provision in the Dodd-Frank law that harms consumers and does absolutely nothing to stabilize markets.

Dodd-Frank directs the Financial Stability Oversight Council to designate banks as systemically important financial institutions, or SIFIs. These designated institutions are subject to surcharges, additional regulation, and an implicit taxpayer bailout. That's right, their bill is what gives Wall Street a bailout.

□ 1400

What we are saying is: let's focus our attention on Wall Street, but let's get regional banks some regulatory relief so that they can serve their customers on Main Street.

The primary test for systemic importance is an arbitrary threshold of \$50 billion. Above that line, an institution is designated systemically important or too big to fail. Above that line, regardless of the institution's risky activities, it is exempt.

This bill that we are supporting does away with this blunt threshold and directs FSOC and its constituent agencies to consider the institution's actual activities to determine if it actually is risky. If it is not, it deserves relief so that it can serve its customers better.

Size is not the only issue. It is interconnectedness. It is risky activities. Many of these regional banks that serve my constituents in central and eastern Kentucky, not Wall Street—central and eastern Kentucky. Farmers, small business owners, and homeowners in Kentucky are being crushed and denied access to capital because of a one-size-fits-all regulation from Washington.

Unlike Dodd-Frank's arbitrary approach, this will better promote financial stability because it actually targets the enhanced regulation to where it belongs and not on Wall Street.

The bottom line is, we are hearing from regional banks around this country, in central Kentucky and other places, that the expense of complying with these enhanced regulations and the SIFI surcharge means less capital

for deployment in mortgages, in automobile loans, and in small business loans, it means higher credit card rates, and it means fewer customer rewards. It impacts these institutions' ability to engage in philanthropy and community development activities.

Treating these regional banks as complex Wall Street firms is simply illogical. These are not multinational Wall Street firms. These are traditional banks that serve Americans on Main Street.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), one of our most thoughtful members on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6392.

This bill, the Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act, offers a commonsense approach to the process of designating systemically important financial institutions. In doing so, it addresses a problem that Republicans and Democrats have complained about for some time.

Dodd-Frank's \$50 billion threshold for identifying SIFIs is a crude and arbitrary way to decide which firms pose a risk to the stability of the financial system. It is important to remember that SIFI designation isn't trivial. When a financial institution is labeled as a SIFI, it faces enhanced regulation, supervision, and costs without regard to the nature of the bank or the bank's business.

Accordingly, SIFI designation impacts a firm's lending ability, and, therefore, the firm's customers, and their customer's ability to thrive.

If we really care about protecting financial stability and having a healthy financial system, we have a responsibility to pursue a fairer, more transparent, and more accurate process. The approach set forth under H.R. 6392 represents a more rational process for evaluating financial institutions, as opposed to the Washington tradition of one-size-fits-all.

Under this bill, the Financial Stability Oversight Council will be required to look at not only the size of a financial institution but also its interconnectedness, complexity, cross-jurisdictional activity, and availability of substitutes. Keep in mind that banks designated as SIFIs today may still be designated as SIFIs under this new approach.

This bill's reforms will inject the FSOC's SIFI designation process with greater clarity and fairness, and it will result in more appropriately targeted regulatory efforts.

I commend Chairman LUETKEMEYER for his work on this important issue, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill in its original form.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, let's take a look at this size question because \$50 billion was selected for a reason, and the reason is this: If you don't have a threshold, we knew at the time, as we know now, that you won't get any banks designated because the banks are going to sue, and they are going to tie you up in court. Well, maybe some will not, but you are going to have a real fight on your hands getting them to be designated, and it can take 2 to 4 years to get it done.

Looking at the banks that are covered, only three of the banks covered are in the \$50-billion range. The top 15 are over \$100 billion, and the top bank is about a half trillion dollars. Again, only in Washington, D.C., would this kind of money—a half trillion dollars for one bank—be considered small change.

We cannot allow the banks to dominate the process. We put the process in the hands of the banks when the regulators have to take them on one at a time.

Finally, what is wrong with telling a bank, "You have to tell us how to eliminate you if you become a systemic risk"? That is what Dodd-Frank does. This bill eliminates the ability of FSOC to determine and tell banks that they must give up.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), one of our hardest working members on the committee.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) for offering this important piece of legislation under consideration today.

The bipartisan Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act replaces an arbitrary asset threshold with an indicator-based approach, which will better assist the Financial Stability Oversight Council in determining the true systemic risk of a financial institution.

It is a mistake for regulators to continue regulating a \$50-billion bank in the same way they regulate trillion-dollar global systemically important institutions. In fact, this view is shared among regulators and legislators. Comptroller Curry, Federal Reserve Board member Tarullo, Senator SHERROD BROWN, and even former Chairman Barney Frank have all made public comments agreeing that the \$50-billion SIFI threshold is not the best determination for imposing heightened prudential standards.

This bill introduces a better, analysis-driven approach, requiring the council to require metrics already established by the Basel Committee on Banking Supervision when it identifies Global Systemically Important Banks.

The Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act will stop the current regulatory model of needlessly increasing compliance costs and forcing insti-

tutions to decrease financial services. By ensuring that the SIFI designation process takes into account indicator factors, financial institutions that were not the cause of the financial crisis will once again be able to fully serve their communities. Not only will this legislation provide relief for stable financial institutions, but it will also allow regulators to focus their resources, working with institutions that pose an actual systemic risk to the financial system.

It is important to note that this legislation does not strip the FSOC of designation powers. It is concerning that some groups oppose a bill that encourages the council to use accepted measuring standards to justify a SIFI designation.

Systemic importance should be determined by appropriate criteria rather than by an arbitrary line that has no justifiable purpose. To advocate for the status quo, and against this legislation, shows a fundamental misunderstanding of the financial system and systemic risk.

I am happy to lend my support to this bill and encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense measure. I, again, thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) for his leadership on this measure.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The gentleman from Missouri has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE). Again, we have a good crop of young folks on our committee, and she is one of those bright stars for us.

Mrs. LOVE. Madam Speaker, we have before us a solution to regulation that causes real harm to an important financial institution, especially in my State, Zions Bancorporation, which supports the financial needs of many families and businesses throughout Utah and the Western States.

Last year, Zions Bancorporation chairman and CEO, Harris Simmons, spoke about increased compliance costs his institution has to face as a result of the enhanced prudential standards requirements of the Dodd-Frank Act. Specifically, Zions has had to divert resources to add nearly 500 additional full-time staff to areas such as compliance, internal audits, credit administration, and enterprise risk management.

Mr. Simmons also testified at the House Financial Services' Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit Subcommittee that these increased compliance costs are offset by reductions in other areas of the organization. Many of them are consumer-facing

functions. In other words, Zions Bank had to move resources away from lending to customers and consumer service because of these extra regulations. Yet, Zions is one of the smallest SIFIs, with a business model centered on very traditional banking activities, primarily commercial lending with a particular focus on lending to smaller businesses.

I support H.R. 6392. It allows banks like Zions Bank to get back to what they do best.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), who brings a wealth of financial services background to the committee.

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and congratulate him on this constructive bill.

This bill today is not about dangerous agendas, greed, signing bonuses, or wholesale exemptions of regulation for 27 big banks—not at all. This bill is about using common sense and taking off the autopilot that is in Dodd-Frank, which designates our SIFIs on size alone. In fact, it includes all the factors that should be considered for institutions that might present a systemic risk.

This is a bipartisan bill that has support on both sides of the aisle. Former Chairman Frank's comments have been read into the RECORD, but how about Governor Dan Tarullo: "Resolution planning and the quite elaborate requirements of our supervisory stress testing process do not seem to me to be necessary for banks between \$50 billion and \$100 billion in assets."

Tom Curry, our comptroller of the currency: "The better approach is to use an asset figure as a first screen and give discretion to the supervisors based on the risks in the business plan and operations."

And Senator SHERROD BROWN, certainly a supporter of Dodd-Frank: "I do agree that some banks above \$50 billion should not be regulated like Wall Street megabanks."

I support this bill.

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

Here we are in the lameduck session of Congress, and we are signaling to special interests all the giveaways that are about to come with Republicans in control of Washington. And we do this just after the President-elect selected a man to head the Treasury Department whose bank has been accused of redlining and violating the Fair Housing Act, whose bank was responsible for about 40 percent of reverse mortgage foreclosures in 2009 to 2014, and whose bank was characterized by a New York judge as engaging in harsh, repugnant, shocking, and repulsive acts against debtors.

Donald Trump ran a campaign on anti-Wall Street rhetoric, but appointing a former hedge fund manager, Gold-

man Sachs, executive and bank CEO, as Treasury Secretary shows his true colors. Mr. Mnuchin is a Wall Street insider with ties to big banks that have a troubling past of putting profits ahead of consumers and taxpayers. Mnuchin, during his time at OneWest, during his time, foreclosed on homes of 36,000 families.

Mr. Mnuchin now sits on the board of CIT, which bought his former bank. Mnuchin took a reported \$10.9-million payout when the merger was completed. CIT's regulatory filings indicate that the bank provides Mr. Mnuchin with annual compensation of \$4.5 million for each of 2015, 2016, and 2017, which gives a base salary of \$800,000, short-term incentives of \$1.4 million, and long-term incentives of \$2.3 million. That is 88 times the household income of the average American family.

What is worse, CIT is a megabank, and, instead of paying back taxpayers, it went bankrupt, like many of Mr. Trump's failed businesses.

□ 1415

Mnuchin is a man who got rich off of the foreclosure crisis and taxpayer bailouts again—not unlike Mr. Trump himself—and he will now have oversight over significant swaps of our financial regulatory system.

H.R. 6392, in particular, is President-elect Trump's and the congressional GOP's first effort to deregulate Wall Street since the election.

This bill stands to benefit just 27 banks in the United States, and one of those banks is Mr. Mnuchin's bank, CIT. In fact, CIT just recently completed a merger with OneWest, which made Mr. Mnuchin rich. That merger also pushed CIT over the \$50-billion threshold that would make the bank subject to Dodd-Frank rules. Rather than submit to more stringent regulation, CIT is trying to grease the skids to get favorable treatment in Congress so that its megamerger won't come with any strings attached. Specifically, this legislation would eliminate CIT from being subjected to more stringent Dodd-Frank rules related to capital, liquidity, risk management, living wills, stress testing, and other crucial requirements that prevent bailouts.

What is more, the legislation would take authority to regulate banks away from our independent regulators and hand that power over to this man, who I am telling you all about, who has a history of proving to have not only foreclosed on a lot of innocent homeowners, but who is, maybe, I think, under investigation now by HUD.

Again, this legislation would take the authority to regulate banks away from our independent regulators and would hand that power over to him. Mr. Mnuchin would now, per H.R. 6392, be in the driver's seat to determine which banks get regulated and how. That means he could give special favors to his bank while ignoring similarly situated banks, not to mention our financial stability.

My friends on the opposite side of the aisle will tell us: Oh, that is a bailout we had to do in order to keep this country from going into a depression.

You force taxpayers to make that bailout—to pay for it. Now here we are today with a President-elect who pays no taxes. So why would he be worried about whether or not we have a bailout?

I would say this is one of the worst bills that is going to come before us; but just like Mr. HENSARLING said: We ain't seen nothing yet.

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

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

Just to recap, the Dodd-Frank came into being as a result of the crisis. One of the solutions was to be able to fine systemically important financial institutions before they brought the economy down. Coming up with the SIFI definition was one way to do that. The problem was that the SIFI designation was too large and was being impacted in too many different and wrongful ways. Even Dodd-Frank's original author, Barney Frank, recognized that with his testimony this past week as well as in our committee.

The metrics that we have in the bill are very simple. They are things that are used by the Financial Stability Board and by the Office of Financial Research when they look at global SIFIs. The CIT and OneWest merger that the ranking member keeps talking about are metrics that were used by the regulators to determine whether that was something they should be doing.

We are not reinventing the wheel here. What we are doing is taking the burden off of the midsized regional banks, which is causing fewer products and services to be able to be provided to the customers at an increased cost; so I ask for the passage of the bill.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 PRINTED IN PART B OF HOUSE REPORT 114-839 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk that would ensure the integrity of H.R. 6392, the Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act of 2016.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act may be construed as broadly applying international standards except as specifically provided under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 113(c) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, as added by section 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 934, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Today's bill spells out the criteria the Financial Stability Oversight Council, FSOC, must use in determining institutions of systemic risk.

My amendment will prevent the Federal Reserve and the Treasury from blindly implementing new regulations proposed by an international entity, whether coming from the Basel Commission or from the unelected bureaucrats on the Financial Stability Board. When Congress begins to apply international standards, we need to make certain that executive agencies don't overreach by simply ratifying every decision that is made internationally.

Recently, the Treasury and the Fed have been found to have made determinations that mirror the standards issued by the Financial Stability Board but without sufficient review—simply rubberstamping them. They have gone along with the decisions that have been made by international unelected bureaucrats and, in the process, have harmed our regional and community banks and Americans' access to credit. Similar concerns have been raised by U.S. insurance companies. That is why Mr. LUETKEMEYER is also sponsoring legislation to make sure that these one-size-fits-all regulations are not used to supersede our State-based insurance regulations here in the United States.

H.R. 6392 will provide the necessary relief and transparency that is needed in these systemic risk designations. I am proud to offer this amendment to clarify that our Federal agencies cannot use the loophole of international recommendations to expand their powers and subject our community and local banks to even more burdensome regulations.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, this bill outsources our domestic regulation by the Federal Reserve and hands it over to an international group of regulators known as the Financial Stability Board, or the FSB, to determine which banks should be regulated by our regulators. It says this international body should decide which banks are regulated, not the United States Congress.

The U.S. is just one member nation among many represented on the FSB, and the Republicans have often criticized this board of regulators for being "shadowy" and not sufficiently deferential to American interests.

Currently, the FSB makes determinations on which global banks are systemically significant—not signifi-

cant to the U.S., but to the entire global economy. This legislation imports those determinations and sets our domestic regulation on autopilot. If the international regulators say you are important, then this bill would grandfather you into Dodd-Frank. If not, then you get the big giveaway of deregulation.

This amendment rightfully says that the U.S. shouldn't be giving away our sovereignty over our economy to international regulators, but the amendment fails to have the courage of its convictions. Curiously, it says that nothing in this bill shall broadly apply international regulatory standards to the U.S., with an exception for the part of the bill that applies international regulatory standards to the U.S.

In summary, Democrats who oppose the deregulation of big banks should oppose H.R. 6392, and Republicans who oppose outsourcing our regulation to foreign bureaucrats should oppose H.R. 6392. This amendment does nothing to solve this fundamental issue in the bill, and this legislation is still deeply problematic even if the amendment is accepted.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) for his interest and for his authoring this amendment.

Madam Speaker, the amendment makes clear that H.R. 6392 should not be construed to allow international standards to be imposed on U.S. institutions. The underlying bill, in two separate places, does rely on a similar framework that is utilized by the Basel Commission and that is used by the Federal Reserve and the Treasury in an effort to ensure that the largest U.S. banks maintain their SIFI designations.

Beyond these provisions, however, it would be highly inappropriate for any international body to use H.R. 6392 to impose any standard on a U.S. entity. It is important to make the point, as we advocate today for risk-based supervision, that we avoid any sort of blanket approach that is so commonly seen out of international regulatory bodies.

In the case of foreign banks in their doing business in the United States, for example, the \$50-billion threshold and its interpretation by the Federal Reserve results in a huge number of banks being treated as SIFIs despite the fact that many of them have under \$10 billion in assets. As we consider these designations, we need to avoid one-size-fits-all models and look at factors like comparable home-country standards before we move forward on enhanced prudential regulation.

I hope we can address some of these issues in the next Congress and that we can work with international regulators, particularly those in the Euro-

pean Union, to avoid the escalation of the ongoing standoff on bank capital rules. We should work collaboratively to inject commonsense into financial regulation that will protect U.S. taxpayers and the financial system without constricting economic growth.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I object to the dispensing of the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Maxine Waters of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6392 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 4, line 17, strike the quotation mark and following semicolon and insert the following:

"(4) CERTAIN COMPANIES WITH PENDING LAWSUITS OR ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS DESIGNATED BY OPERATION OF LAW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, a bank holding company shall be deemed to have been the subject of a final determination under paragraph (1) if the bank holding company, as of the date of enactment of this subsection—

"(A) has total consolidated assets equal to or greater than \$50,000,000,000; and

"(B) has disclosed in a filing with the Commission that a department or agency of the United States Government has a pending lawsuit or enforcement action against the bank holding company related to the origination, securitization, or sale of residential mortgage-backed securities."

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam 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.

Madam Speaker, make no mistake. This bill is the opening salvo in the Trump plan to dismantle Dodd-Frank. The House Republicans have been trying for 6 years, ever since we passed Wall Street reform; and on the eve of the President-elect's taking office, this is their big chance to deregulate 27 of the Nation's largest banks.

This bill would strip rules around capital, liquidity, stress testing, and living wills—key components to guard against catastrophic bank failures. These are not community banks. No. These are \$50-, \$100-, \$200-, and \$400-billion banks that engage in exotic products like “pick-a-payment,” which is when you choose how much you want to pay; and “negative amortization” loans, which is when, incredibly, the loan principal goes up, not down, leading up to the financial crisis.

□ 1430

This bill would strip Fed Chair Janet Yellen of the Fed's independent authority and hand it over to Trump's Wall Street Treasury Secretary, a man who foreclosed on 36,000 families when he ran this bank, a man who has been accused of redlining and fair lending discrimination by civil rights and advocacy groups, a man who would be handed the authority to deregulate the bank on whose board he now serves, if this bill became law. But those conflicts of interest are par for the course in this incoming administration.

President-elect Donald Trump has more conflicts of interest than any incoming President in the history of this country. Trump's son-in-law and close adviser, Jared Kushner, has hundreds of millions of dollars in loans outstanding from domestic and foreign banks and has obtained development financing through a controversial U.S. program that sells green cards.

Legal scholars believe Trump's lease with the government over the Old Post Office Building where his hotel in Washington, D.C., stands will trigger a breach of contract and a conflict of interest the moment he is sworn in. And Trump may even violate the Constitution on the day he takes office, with former-President Bush's ethics lawyer saying that foreign diplomats staying in his hotels would be an unlawful foreign gift.

Madam Speaker, this amendment highlights yet another conflict of interest we are facing. President-elect Trump is deeply indebted to Deutsche Bank. Over the past two decades, Deutsche Bank has been a lender or a co-

lender in at least \$2.5 billion in loans to Donald Trump or his companies.

Here is a sampling of Trump's indebtedness to Deutsche: The businesses within Trump's network currently owe Deutsche Bank nearly \$360 million in outstanding principal, including \$125 million for his Florida golf course, up to \$69 million for his Chicago high-rise, and a \$170 million line of credit used to fund the development of his new hotel in Washington, DC.

This legislation, H.R. 6392, deregulates huge megabanks representing almost 30 percent of the assets currently subject to stricter rules under Dodd-Frank. In the bill, it is possible that the U.S. operations of global megabanks—megabanks like Deutsche Bank—would also be deregulated. And with Donald Trump's appointments interpreting the law, I suspect they will indeed deregulate these global megabanks.

Why is this important? Well, it is important because Deutsche Bank has a potential \$14 billion settlement with the Department of Justice pending related to toxic mortgages they packaged and sold leading up to the financial crisis. They sliced and diced subprime loans and duped not only homeowners, but unsuspecting investors. Just like President-elect Trump, they saw the specter of a foreclosure crisis and financial collapse as a business opportunity, not a human tragedy. After Trump's election, news headlines said that Deutsche Bank stood to get a windfall because the new sheriffs in town would go easy on them.

This amendment says enough is enough. While the Trump Justice Department may give Deutsche Bank a break, the United States Congress will not stand idly by and let Trump's conflicts of interest grease the skids for powerful interests in Washington.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Speaker, just to highlight some comments here with regard to the ranking member's last discussion on this point of order, we believe the motion to recommit has absolutely nothing to do with financial stability.

Title 1 of the bill deals with operational standards of bank holding companies. This bill we are working with deals directly with how regulators deal with banks. A pending lawsuit has nothing to do with the financial stability of this bank. This may belong somewhere else in the Dodd-Frank bill, but it doesn't belong in here.

With regards to the underlying bill as well, Madam Speaker, to reiterate

some of the points that have been discussed already, we have a situation where the fix for the crisis of 2008 was Dodd-Frank, as was spoken to eloquently by some of my colleagues. Some of the fixes—no bill we put together around here is ever perfect. There are always problems with it. It always needs to be tweaked down the road.

This particular issue we are talking about today, systemically important designation of institutions, was part of a solution to try and be able to identify banks, by definition, that would bring down the entire economy so this couldn't ever happen again. If we have a big bank go down, it could be of such a size and magnitude and connectedness that it would bring down the entire economy. One of the unintended consequences of this is that these regulations have rolled downhill to small, midsized banks. It was unintended, but they are a consequence.

Barney Frank, the author of the bill, has said on numerous occasions—in fact, in our committee, he testified to the fact that this is an unintended consequence—it should be fixed. That is what this bill does. It fixes that problem.

These unintended consequences of all these rules and regulations, which carry costs with them, are rolling downhill to these midsized regional banks; and even at that, they are rolling below that, below 50. If you are talking \$10 billion to \$50 billion banks, they will tell you that all of the things that the midsized banks above are dealing with, they are dealing with that as well. So these regulations that are supposed to be for the big banks—a trillion dollars and over or whatever—are rolling all the way downhill to the small banks, the small community banks.

Now, they will argue about the fact that \$50 billion is an arbitrary figure. It is something we need to keep. That is a big bank.

I am sorry. Madam Speaker, I was a regulator in my former life, and I was a banker in a former life. I can tell you that is a big bank, but that is not something that is going to bring down the economy unless they are interconnected. The metrics in my bill say that if they are interconnected—they have got all sorts of other risky actions they are engaged in—\$50 billion is not going to do it.

Things that you have to look at are size and all these other criteria that we have in here. And these are not criteria pulled out of the air. These are criteria that the Federal Stability Board uses, that the Office of Financial Research uses when they look at G-SIBs, which are global SIBs. So these are analysis tools that are there and have been there for a long time.

Why not give the examiners, the regulators, these tools? I can tell you, as a regulator, they already do this.

A while ago, the point was made it takes the regulator about 12 months, in my bill, to come up with these designations. The regulators already do this.

They have got the information in hand. There is no reason that they can't do this in a 12-month period. I have been there. I have done that. It is easy to do. They have the information.

So what we are doing is taking existing criteria and asking them to look at the risk and the business model of this particular entity to see if it is something that is big enough and connected enough to go down. \$50 billion is not someplace where a bank should be that it is going to cause the entire economy to collapse, no way. Common sense will tell you that.

So, to close out here very quickly, I think that we have a situation where these regulations are costing money to the consumers, to the businesses that the banks lend to. One quick factoid is 75 percent of the banks before Dodd-Frank had free checking, now only 37 percent.

Those are just some of the facts, as they roll downhill, that show that these regulations are having a negative effect on our economy and our local communities. The banks we are talking about are not the gigantic interconnected globals, folks. These are large community banks, which is basically what they all are, that serve communities and mom-and-pop shops. We want to keep them in business. We want to keep our communities growing.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam 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.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON H. RES. 933, PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE IN THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H. Res. 933 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE IN THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 933) providing amounts for further expenses of the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 933

Resolved,

SECTION 1. AMOUNTS FOR COMMITTEE EXPENSES.

For further expenses of the Committee on Energy and Commerce (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the "Committee") for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives not more than \$800,000.

SEC. 2. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the Committee, signed by the Chairman of the Committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter in the RECORD on the consideration of H. Res. 933, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 933, a resolution that authorizes additional funds for the Committee on Energy and Commerce's budget for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

Last year, on October 7, the House passed, by a majority vote, a measure creating a Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives within the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Our committee has the responsibility to ensure that each committee of the House has sufficient resources to fulfill their assigned oversight duties.

Last year, our committee transferred funds from the committee reserve ac-

count to the Energy and Commerce Committee so that the panel could begin its work. An additional transfer was made earlier this year. These funds were allocated based on the full committee's need to fulfill its mission. These initial transfers were insufficient to cover the costs associated with the select panel.

The measure before us on the House floor today will rectify this situation and allow the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives to continue to operate until the end of this Congress.

□ 1445

Passing this measure to provide additional funds is an institutional responsibility. If we do not allocate these additional funds, the work of the entire Committee on Energy and Commerce, both for the majority and minority, would grind to a halt. The committee would be unable to complete its vital work. This work covers important areas, such as electronic communications, environmental protection, and health care. We saw this week the important work of the committee in the 21st Century Cures Act.

There are differences of opinion on the creation of the select investigative panel. However, we are not here to relitigate a decision that the House made more than a year ago but to fulfill our institutional responsibilities. It is my hope that we will swiftly pass this measure today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to this resolution and in opposition to the existence of the panel generally. It has been nothing more than a partisan witch hunt that will ultimately cost taxpayers over a million dollars and has found no wrongdoing by the people it was created to investigate. Three House committees and 13 States have launched their own similar investigations and came to the same conclusion.

The panel has been a one-sided operation from the start, with the majority failing to consult and inform the minority on official actions and withholding panel records and documents.

The dangers of this panel go far beyond simply wasting taxpayer money. It is a direct assault on women's health care and the right to choose. The panel's actions also put at risk the lives of researchers working to find cures to our most debilitating and deadly diseases. It is my hope that this is the last we hear of it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 26 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), and ask unanimous consent that she be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the chairman of the select investigative panel.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, the select investigative panel was formed to investigate areas that, prior to the revelations of undercover journalists, received too little attention. For most of us, it is nothing short of an outrage that Planned Parenthood and other abortion clinics supplement their budgets by selling the leftover parts of babies they have aborted.

This Chamber charged the panel with investigating fetal tissue trafficking, second and third trimester abortion practices, the standard of care for infants who survive abortions, and the role our taxpayer dollars play in this sector of society. Over the last year, we have held hearings that explored the bioethics surrounding fetal tissue use, and that revealed the sobering reality of how fetal tissue is priced.

Our investigation revealed four models by which the subjects of our investigation implicate serious public policy concerns. The first, the middleman model, comprises a middleman and tissue procurer that obtains tissue directly from a source such as an abortion clinic or hospital and then transfers the tissue to a customer, usually a university researcher.

As the example of StemExpress illustrates, the procurement company would embed a lab technician inside an abortion clinic, where the technician would receive the day's orders for body parts at specified gestation periods, access patient files in violation of women's HIPAA privacy rights, and collect the tissue. Then the technician would receive pay and even bonuses based on the tissue she secured.

A second model, the university clinic model, reveals the cozy relationship between abortion clinics and research institutions, most of them State universities funded by the taxpayers. The clinic provides the university the tissue used for research. The university adopts the clinic doctors as faculty members, giving them benefits regardless of whether they actually teach. And, in many cases, thanks to programs like the Ryan Fellowship, medical students are deployed to abortion clinics to be trained as the next generation of abortion providers.

The panel's investigation into a third model, the late-term abortion clinic, revealed the appalling absence of mechanisms or procedures to safeguard those infants who survive the abortion procedure. Put bluntly, even though we have the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act and the prohibition of partial birth abortion on the books, they are not enforced.

Fourth, the panel investigated the model by which Federal tax dollars make their way to abortion clinics, typically by Medicaid payments under title XIX, and fetal tissue researchers.

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

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, to provide just a snapshot of the 51 known external audits of Planned Parenthood clinics, nearly all found title XIX overpayments for family planning and reproductive health service claims. The overbilling totalled more than \$8.5 million, and that is without counting several False Claims Act lawsuits that allege millions more in overbilling.

Consider all that our panel has identified, despite having just barely a year—even less by the time we were fully staffed—to conduct the investigation. It is now up to us to build on the work, to hold the government accountable, and to stop these affronts to human dignity.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding the time to me, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation to fund the select investigative panel, the panel that we call the select panel to attack women's health.

It really shouldn't come as any surprise that one of the very first things that the Republicans have done coming back now to Washington is to approve additional funding for this select so-called investigative panel, doubling its budget and putting it on track to spend nearly \$1.6-million taxpayer funds by the end of this year.

This investigation is essentially built on a pack of lies that are perpetrated by anti-abortion extremists and has never been and has no chance of becoming a fact-based investigation. The panel Republicans have continually relied on, even today, doctored videotapes, so-called evidence, even though that evidence and those videotapes have been discredited already by three House committees, 13 States, and a Texas grand jury.

Throughout this investigation, Republicans have abused congressional authority, issuing 42 unilateral subpoenas in violation of House rules, demanding that clinics and universities name names of their doctors, students, and staff, and releasing some of these names knowing that doing so puts lives in danger, a truly McCarthyesque attack on individuals. They have compared researchers to Nazi war criminals and echoed the words of anti-abortion activists that were also used by a gunman who shot 12 people, killing 3 at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs.

Despite Republicans' failure to find any evidence of wrongdoing, they continue to make inflammatory, grotesque allegations to justify the panel's existence, and, by their words and actions, have put lifesaving research and women's health care at risk.

The panel has already had a chilling effect on research, drying up the supply of needed tissue for research on multiple sclerosis and threatening research

on other diseases from A to Z, Alzheimer's to Zika.

Fetal tissue research has historically had broad, bipartisan support. It is the basis for key vaccines that have saved, literally, millions and millions of lives, including the polio vaccine. That is why over 60 of our Nation's leading medical institutions released an open letter in support of scientific research using fetal tissue.

We cannot afford to let a set of reckless and irresponsible claims stop this vital medical research. This panel and its investigation are a disgrace to this House of Representatives. We need to end this dangerous and unjustified witch hunt, and, instead of providing more funding for this divisive and dangerous inquisition, Congress should shut down this panel and put an end to its shameful proceedings.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. I thank the gentleman. As a member of the select investigative panel, I rise in support of H. Res. 933.

Madam Speaker, after the release of the undercover videos of Planned Parenthood, one little known tissue procurement company became a household name: StemExpress. They are one of the biggest players in the sale of aborted-baby body parts in the United States. In clear violation of the intent of Federal law, they promise profits to abortion clinics in return for otherwise discarded—and I will use their quote—products of conception.

The select panel learned that in order to make as much tissue available for sale as possible, and thus rake in huge profits, StemExpress sought to contract with the National Abortion Federation. Contracting with this network of abortion clinics would mean access to thousands of baby body parts, which StemExpress could procure, then turn around and sell at huge markups.

Our investigation found that they had created a drop-down menu—here is a copy of part of it—on their Web site, such as one might find on Amazon.com, to facilitate their sales. Their buyers could select the gestational age, the type of tissue, and the number of specimens. For example, you could select three 12-week-old baby scalps, twelve 14-week-old baby brains, one 15-week pair of baby eyes, or seven 16-week baby livers, to name just a few of the combinations. For crying out loud, this is the Amazon.com of baby body parts. It is outrageous. It is disgusting. It is a very disturbing practice that has been tucked away and out of sight for too long.

The CEO of StemExpress told one undercover journalist over lunch and a glass of wine that some of the buyers' lab techs "freak out and have meltdowns" when they see little baby hands and little baby feet attached to an order of limbs. So she makes sure her techs cut off the hands and the feet before shipping off boxes of these body

parts. It is this callous, dark talk that has so many Americans concerned with the state of research in our country.

The select panel is proud to support lifesaving ethical research, but, like the rest of America, my colleagues and I know that ethical boundaries do exist, and I hope StemExpress' research will cease to come at the expense of unborn children who have had no say in the so-called donation of their body parts. Many years from now, we will look back on this practice as a dark and horrible time where humanity and human dignity lost to financial profits. We must end this horrific practice. I urge support for this resolution.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished member on our team of the select panel.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, from start to finish, this select panel has abused congressional power in order to intimidate and threaten private people and entities engaged in legal businesses in constitutionally protected health care.

Republicans on the select panel have now spent \$1.5 million on this so-called investigation. What do they have to show the American people for spending their hard-earned tax dollars? They have not presented any evidence that any entity broke the law surrounding fetal tissue donation or research. They have not presented any evidence that any entity or physician engaged in the horrifying behavior of which Republicans accuse them. We have heard today on this floor, as we have repeatedly from the select panel, the oft-proven lies that Planned Parenthood sold fetal tissue for profit. We have heard the lie that the clearly doctored and disproven videotapes bore some relationship to reality.

□ 1500

We have heard today on this floor, as we have repeatedly from the select panel, the oft disproved lies that Planned Parenthood sold fetal tissue for profit. We have heard the lie that the clearly doctored and disproved videotapes bore some relationship to reality. We have heard the disproved lie that StemExpress procured fetal tissue not for lifesaving medical research, but for profit.

The Republicans have wasted countless hours and millions of dollars running in circles after evidence that doesn't exist. They have insisted over and over again that entities name names, with no promise or plan to protect those individuals; and when asked to explain why they needed names, they simply refused to answer. When Republicans on the panel did get names, they released some of them publicly, even though they knew that doing so would expose the doctors, researchers, and other private individuals to harassment, threats, and even murder.

The Republicans on the panel have repeatedly made baseless accusations of wrongdoing, with no concern for the consequences. They have had a chilling effect on lifesaving medical research through their intimidation tactics. They have flown in the face of congressional rules and abused congressional power to meet their own blatantly partisan ends. And now the Republicans on the select panel have the audacity to ask for more taxpayer money to fund this witch hunt.

In words once addressed to the last Member of Congress to so clearly violate congressional authority, Senator Joseph McCarthy, I ask my Republican colleagues: "At long last, have you no sense of decency?"

I call on all of my colleagues today to remember their decency. This grotesque and murderous panel should have been shut down long ago. Vote against the previous question, vote against this absurd funding bill, and stand up for the American taxpayer and for the dignity of this institution.

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, one of the striking discoveries we have made in this investigation has been the sheer number of laws implicated by the troubling actions of abortion providers, tissue procurement businesses, and researchers. One such law is the HIPAA privacy rule.

The panel's investigation uncovered a series of business contracts between StemExpress, which is a tissue procurement business that is not covered by HIPAA, and several abortion clinics that are. StemExpress paid fees to the abortion clinics for fetal tissue and maternal blood and then resold the fetal tissue and the blood to researchers.

Here is a quick HIPAA privacy tutorial:

The HIPAA privacy rule protects all individually identifiable health information, known as protected health information, or PHI, that is held or transmitted by a covered entity. This information identifies an individual or can reasonably be believed to be useful in identifying an individual, such as a name or an address, and includes demographic data related to her physical or mental health, condition, treatment, and payments.

The panel's investigation indicates that StemExpress and four abortion clinics, including three Planned Parenthood locations, committed systemic violations of a HIPAA privacy rule over a course of about 5 years. The abortion clinics provided patients' private, protected health information to StemExpress to help them obtain human fetal tissue for resale.

How did they do this? Well, the abortion clinics permitted the employees of StemExpress to enter their clinics to obtain human fetal tissue from the aborted infants, obtain protected health information about their pa-

tients, interact with the patients, and, yes, even seek and obtain patient consent for the tissue donation.

StemExpress did not have a medically valid reason to see, and the abortion clinics did not have a reason to disclose, the patients' private information. Instead, the abortion clinics intentionally shared patients' most intimate private information with StemExpress to financially benefit StemExpress and the clinics.

The panel has made a referral of each of these entities to the Department of Health and Human Services and has requested a swift and full investigation by the HHS Office for Civil Rights. But more importantly, we have discovered a deeply concerning violation of a law that protects the most cherished privacy rights.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I just find it so hypocritical that the majority is talking about putting peoples' private names out into the public when we have had people who have been attacked and lives threatened as a result of them putting names out there.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), another distinguished member of our select panel.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition.

This resolution provides an additional \$800,000 of taxpayer money to a select investigative panel that should never have been created in the first place. As a member of that panel, I can tell you it has been nothing more than a bully pulpit for the majority to spread extreme anti-choice falsehoods and fabrications, with no basis in reality. This so-called investigation has repeatedly shown contempt for the facts and disdain for the truth.

Instead of carrying out a fair and evidence-based process, the panel has spent the last year publicly targeting women's healthcare providers, bullying scientists and medical students, delaying medical research, and trying to cut off lines of scientific inquiry, all because the majority opposes a woman's constitutional right to choose.

Now we are voting to double the panel's budget. It is ridiculous. No one in this Chamber should be condoning this kind of harassment and intimidation, let alone approving hundreds of thousands of additional taxpayer dollar to do so. This has been a brazenly partisan and ideological witch hunt, and it should have been shut down months ago.

Rather than wasting another \$800,000 on this dangerous panel, Congress could use that money to provide more than 270,000 school lunches to low-income students, purchase nearly 12,000 textbooks to make higher education more affordable for college students, or purchase more than 3 million diapers to help new mothers care for their babies. But instead, that money will go toward intimidating doctors, harassing researchers, and delaying the progress of science. It is shameful.

We shouldn't throw good many after bad by passing this legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), who is a medical doctor.

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, this is about infant lives, but I would like address what else it is about. It is about science and research. The other side seems to only want to focus on politics and scare tactics.

From the beginning, we recognized the other side would try to avert attention from our investigation by falsely claiming we are opposed to science. As a doctor, I find that offensive, and I think it is a dangerous practice to introduce fear into important scientific debates.

Every member of the panel is committed to medical research that finds cures. The rhetoric that we are opposed to cures for Zika, HIV, Alzheimer's, or Parkinson's is just ridiculous and wrong.

The United States of America is a global leader in scientific research. We should all be proud of the research enterprise in our country and support it with tax dollars. The House Select Panel on Infant Lives shares this support. We are strongly committed to promoting both basic and clinical research.

The goal of the House select panel is not to oppose science but, rather, to determine how best to support science so that this important work can advance as rapidly as possible without ethical compromise. As the history of biomedical research in the 20th century clearly demonstrates, when scientific research is separated from ethics or the law, grave injustice can occur.

We here in Congress, like the rest of Americans, care deeply about protecting the rights of patients and ensuring ethical oversight of research procedures. These are not meant to "hinder" advances in science but, rather, to ensure that the scientific enterprise more perfectly fulfills its promise to society by advancing in a manner that is both just and ethical.

Through the panel's investigation, we have discovered inaccuracies about the role of human fetal tissue and have sought to correct them to realistically address the obstacles facing research.

Any argument from the 1950s—or even the 1990s, for that matter—about biomedical research is outdated, and the actual record is clear: human fetal tissue did not directly result in a vaccine for diseases like measles. Similarly, the Nobel Prize was not awarded for curing polio using human fetal tissue. In fact, of the 75 vaccines in use today, not one was produced using fetal tissue.

Furthermore, the NIH has not funded fetal tissue transplant grants for nearly 10 years. That should tell us something. We examined 30 major grants that were funded by the NIH over the last 5 years and found that human fetal

tissue research represents only a tiny fraction of the overall scientific enterprise. In fact, only 0.2 percent used human fetal tissue.

Hysterical calls for enhanced fetal tissue research through expanded abortion licenses are a matter of politics, not medicine or science. A small subset of NIH-funded grants use fetal tissue to study things like birth defects. These types of grants represent only 1 in 100,000.

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

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Tissue or cells for these studies could be derived from another source than aborted babies, like premature natural demise infants whose parents are willing to donate. The other grants use fetal tissue when alternatives are easily available, like placenta, cord blood, or modified adult stem cells.

Some grants even study adult macular degeneration. Research on adult macular degeneration should be conducted on adult donor eyes, but these grants are instead using fetal eyes from aborted infants—not because of science, but because of convenience.

Madam Speaker, I know these things can be uncomfortable to discuss, but that is why the other side wants to avoid the facts and that is why this debate is so important. It is about conducting medical research in an ethical and just manner. So let's sit down and talk science with the NIH and others so that research works for everyone in an ethical and moral way.

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Illinois has 21½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I am disappointed that we are here today asking the American taxpayers to waste another \$800,000 on an unnecessary, dangerous investigation.

This select panel was formed based on fraudulent videos created by anti-abortion extremists to attack Planned Parenthood, an organization that has always fought for women's rights and provides healthcare services to 3 million women and men each year.

I was proud to be the first Member of Congress to speak out against these videos immediately after their release. And here we are, a year and a half later, with no evidence of wrongdoing after 17 separate investigations in three House committees, 13 States, and one grand jury. Yet Republicans continue to chase false, inflammatory allegations, at a severe cost to advances in medicine and to the safety of those involved in this lifesaving research.

Panel Republicans have conducted themselves in ways reminiscent of Joe McCarthy's abusive tactics: witnesses have been harassed and intimidated during testimony; names of researchers, students, clinical personnel, and doctors have been released publicly, placing their lives in great danger; misleading "exhibits" have been manufactured; critical documents have been withheld from Democrats; and Republicans have continued to fan the flames of anti-abortion extremism with their inflammatory rhetoric.

Let us not forget the horrible tragedy that occurred in a Colorado Planned Parenthood clinic where a gunman shot 12 people and killed 3, echoing the same anti-abortion rhetoric used by Republicans to this day.

What this investigation truly is is an attack on women's rights and women's access to legal health services. The select panel comes at a time when Republicans have repeatedly voted to defund Planned Parenthood, eliminate family planning services, and restrict access to abortions.

This investigation dishonors this institution and hurts the American people that Congress is elected to serve. Let's put an end to the witch hunt, stop wasting taxpayer dollars, and reject this resolution.

□ 1515

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives investigation has uncovered many valid concerns and potential law violations that are disturbing, horrific, and unacceptable.

In the course of our investigation, we discovered a hardness, a callousness, and a track record of deceptive tactics that some abortion clinics and fetal tissue procurers exercised toward vulnerable women. It is difficult to imagine a more vulnerable time in a woman's life than when she is considering an abortion.

What if, during that time, the woman is lied to and told that, by having an abortion, she will facilitate research that will cure tragic diseases?

This is exactly the type of concern that our panel addressed during our hearing on bioethics and fetal tissue. During that hearing, I shared a consent form widely used by abortion clinics to obtain a mother's consent to donate fetal tissue. And the form stated that research using the blood from pregnant women and tissue that has been aborted has been used to treat and find a cure for such diseases as diabetes, Parkinson's Disease, Alzheimer's disease, cancer, and AIDS. This is clearly false.

The witness, who is an ethics expert, agreed and he said that the idea of promise of cures found in the form was a "very powerful motivator." He also expressed concern that the scientific community's standards for fetal tissue donation are absent in that consent

form, saying, “the thoroughness of the consent seems to be missing in this form.”

A researcher for the minority testified during the hearing. He also agreed, stating the form would not have made it past his institutional review board. Yet, this is what is being used in abortion clinics with vulnerable women.

In other words, the testimony provided by both of the witnesses from the majority and the minority raised concerns that the principles embodied in ethics reports, and later incorporating the Federal regulations, are not being followed by abortion providers seeking consent for the donation of human fetal tissue.

We must raise this awareness, make sure people know, and make sure that women are protected.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), not only someone who has been such a stalwart for women’s rights and reproductive rights, but the co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus in the House of Representatives.

(Ms. DEGETTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, so this panel was supposed to be set up to investigate the alleged sale of fetal tissue, which is illegal under current law. That didn’t turn out so well.

So now, as you can hear from the other side of the aisle, they are going after fetal tissue research itself, something that has been legal and used in an ethical way since the 1930s, something which has been used to find most vaccines and other cures for diseases in this country, something which a panel appointed by President Ronald Reagan, found unanimously in 1980 to be ethical.

So I want to ask, Madam Speaker, what the heck are we being asked to spend another \$800,000 on?

The total funding for this witch hunt and this reckless endeavor is now more than \$1.5 million. We have gone after women and punished them. We have gone after medical professionals and put their lives at risk, like what happened in my neighborhood of Colorado Springs, Colorado. We have put doctors and researchers on the line, and we have had a chilling effect on important biomedical research.

I say enough is enough. We need to disband this select committee. We need to continue to make sure that we have ethical medical research in this country because, frankly, that will lead to the cures that affect diseases that affect millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, from its start, the Select Panel has been nothing but a partisan witch hunt. The apparent goal of the Select Panel is to punish and intimidate women medical professionals and researchers who are following the law. Through wanton use of subpoenas, inflammatory language and release of private information—including addresses and phone numbers where those wishing to harass health

care providers can find them—the Select Panel as put many, many people at risk. It has also threatened life-saving research and health care that these people provide.

Make no mistake: this threat is very real. Clinics are picketed and fire-bombed, doctors and their families are targeted at their homes, and some have even been murdered.

Furthermore, the Select Panel is trying to force universities and clinics to turn over the names of their researchers, graduate students, lab and clinic staff and doctors—for no legitimate congressional reason. Not since Joe McCarthy have we seen such abusive pressure tactics to “name names.”

The Select Panel is acting as judge, jury, and executioner and endangering lives. It is time for Speaker RYAN to disband this panel—rather than let it gorge even more on taxpayer funds.

Like the seventeen investigations that preceded it, the Select Panel has found no evidence of wrongdoing by Planned Parenthood, other providers, researchers or the companies that facilitate life-saving research and health care for women.

The Washington Post editorial board called on Speaker RYAN to disband the Select Committee months ago, noting that it “has issued indiscriminate subpoenas, intimidated witnesses and relied on misleading information. It is abusing power at taxpayer expense, and Democrats are right to demand its shutdown.” The paper added, “There is no legitimate reason for this inquiry.”

The Select Panel is a waste of funds, an attack on women’s rights, a danger to life-saving medical research and an abusive use of Congressional power for mere partisan gain.

So Mr. Speaker, I say enough with the smear campaigns, fishing expeditions and endless stream of subpoenas. Congressional bullying to frighten women out of exercising their rights, and to drive researchers and healthcare providers out of business, has to stop.

We in the minority have long called for the Select Committee to be disbanded before it does any more damage. I look forward to closing this shameful chapter in Congressional history at the end of this year.

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), who is also a medical doctor.

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I am glad the gentlewoman talked about the need for ethical medical research because one of our panel’s accomplishments is to show how StemExpress undermined the very foundations of ethical American scientific research.

First, Federal regulations require researchers to obtain informed consent from each person used as a subject. The basic element of informed consent includes a detailed explanation of the purposes of the research for which tissue is being obtained. StemExpress, as we found, simply did not follow that requirement.

HHS regulations also require that in obtaining consent, researchers “minimize the possibility of coercion or undue influence.” Well, StemExpress documents that we uncovered shows that its employees were already promising to deliver baby body parts even

before the abortions were performed. That raises serious concerns that there may have been coercion or undue influence on women to donate parts of their aborted babies.

Now, second, Federal regulations require that all research that involves human subjects needs approval from an institutional review board, or IRB. As a medical researcher, I had to file IRB applications and receive IRB approval from my university’s IRB.

Now, it turns out that StemExpress received their IRB approval from a company called BioMed IRB, a California firm that is basically an online, mail order IRB that the Federal Government actually barred for 2 years because they violated FDA rules in granting their IRB approval.

The FDA gave the panel its file on BioMed IRB. Madam Speaker, that file literally was more than a foot high.

HHS regulations require IRBs to “prepare and maintain adequate documentation” of their activities, including: copies of all research proposals reviewed, records of continuing review activities, and copies of all correspondence between the IRB and the investigators, in this case, StemExpress’ founder and CEO, Cate Dyer.

Now, the panel subpoenaed BioMed IRB for all documents related to its approval of StemExpress’ research protocol. BioMed IRB’s executive director informed the panel that, in regards to those records, “there are none.” In other words, BioMed clearly violated Federal regulations on IRBs.

The head of BioMed went further. He told the panel to just bring on a contempt proceeding. That is the IRB StemExpress used. That says a lot about StemExpress’ motives and it says a lot about the accomplishments of the select panel. None of these shameful practices would have been discovered if not for the panel’s investigative work this year.

As a physician and researcher, I know that if I had used the same shady tactics as StemExpress and BioMed IRB, at best, my research reputation would be at risk and, at worst, I would be facing prison.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Res. 933, legislation that would waste an additional 800,000 taxpayer dollars on the partisan witch hunt against Planned Parenthood.

I learned from a young age the value of making quality reproductive health care available to everyone. In the rural town I grew up in, too many young women didn’t have access to family planning services. Too many got pregnant, dropped out of school, and never pursued their dreams. That is why, in college, I volunteered with Planned Parenthood to ensure legal access to the full range of safe family planning services for all women.

So instead of funding a sham investigation, \$800,000 could fund lifesaving

breast exams, pregnancy tests, Pap smears, and ovarian cancer screenings.

Today I stand with women and men across this country to speak out against a baseless investigation, which has shamefully wasted tax dollars to attack the very people who most need our help.

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Madam Speaker, my colleagues on the other side have said that the three House Committee investigations related to the sale of fetal tissue have produced nothing. Others have said that the State Attorney General investigations have also looked into the matter and have found nothing. They complain that this is a waste of time and they complain that it is a waste of money.

First of all, there is so much that we don't know and the American people don't know and still don't understand about this industry. However, since the panel's investigation, we have uncovered alarming revelations about the fetal tissue industry and, because of this, there have been criminal and regulatory referrals. They have resulted in numerous investigations around the Nation, and I will highlight eight of these.

First, the panel discovered that the University of New Mexico was violating their State's Anatomical Gift Act by receiving tissue from late-term abortion clinics. This is currently being investigated.

Second, the panel made a forensic accounting analysis of StemExpress' limited production and determined that they were profiting from the sale of baby body parts. Now the El Dorado District Attorney and the United States Department of Justice are investigating this.

Third, the panel learned that StemExpress and certain abortion clinics were violating HIPAA privacy rights of vulnerable women for the sole purpose of increasing and harvesting fetal tissue to make money.

Fourth, the panel discovered that an abortion clinic in Arkansas violated State law when it sent tissue to StemExpress. This, too, is under investigation.

Fifth, the panel discovered that a university in Ohio was trafficking in baby body parts, an illegal act under Ohio State law.

Sixth, it was discovered that DV Biologics, another tissue procurement company, was profiting from the sale of fetal tissue and violated California State law. This case has been filed.

Seventh, recently the panel learned that Planned Parenthood of Gulf Coast violated both Texas and U.S. law when it sold baby body parts to the University of Texas.

Eighth, the panel also learned that Advanced Bioscience Resources made a profit when it sold tissue to various universities.

As elected Representatives, we are tasked with oversight of our govern-

ment that enforces our laws. These eight referrals are proof of potential criminal activity in the fetal tissue industry. They justify the existence of the panel and their investigations.

The work of the select panel is not over. More referrals will come, and we need to complete this process. Continued funding for the panel's unfinished work is needed.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to fund the investigative work and fulfill the obligations that we have to the American people and the rule of law.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, let me just say that bogus referrals do not a conviction make, and that StemExpress had offered many times to come in with its procurement officers and answer all the questions. They were denied that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Republicans today are asking us to spend more than \$1.5 million to conduct a radical, dangerous inquisition that targets and intimidates private citizens.

To satisfy their seemingly unquenchable obsession with rolling back women's reproductive rights and access to basic health care, this overreaching panel recklessly has demanded names, and interferes in the lives of law-abiding students, scientists, and researchers whose private lives and jobs have been turned upside down by their own government.

What do we have to show for this display of government abuse?

Absolutely nothing. In fact, it is worse than nothing.

Today, they are invoking institutional responsibility to ask the taxpayers to foot a bill for \$800,000 of their own cost overruns. This is money that could have been used to help families, feed the hungry, help our veterans and military families, and go toward education.

I urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous abuse of power and taxpayer funding.

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding.

Let's be really clear about what this is about. This is about following the law. We negotiate, we vote, we pass laws, the President signs them, and they should be enforced. That is what this conversation is about, Madam Speaker.

StemExpress has thumbed its nose against the select investigative panel and obstructed our efforts to bring light to the fetal tissue procurement industry.

□ 1530

Nearly a year ago, the panel requested information from StemExpress

regarding where they procured their fetal tissue, whom they distributed the fetal tissue to, any communications instructing the company's employees to procure fetal tissue, and all accounting records and banking records related to fetal tissue.

StemExpress, in response to that request, has given us none—zero—no document. So to compel StemExpress to provide the panel with this information, the panel issued the company a subpoena. Instead of complying with the subpoena, StemExpress only turned over limited information to the panel, and the information that they turned over to us was so heavily redacted that it was completely useless for investigative purposes.

To date, the select panel has not received a single accounting or bank record from StemExpress. So they have failed to comply with our requests and our subpoenas in violation of the law.

If StemExpress is within the limits of the law, if nothing is illegal or immoral, then why does StemExpress refuse to turn over all the documents that our panel has requested? Opening your accounting records to a congressional panel shouldn't be that difficult.

StemExpress has had plenty of time to get their act together and provide us with the requested documents that we have asked for. Other organizations that we have reached out to and made the same requests to have turned over the documents in a pretty timely fashion.

For failure to comply with our subpoenas, this panel has recommended the House hold Cate Dyer, the CEO of StemExpress, in contempt of Congress.

Despite StemExpress' best efforts to stonewall this investigation, the panel did find out the name of StemExpress' bank which we subpoenaed. The bank provided us with StemExpress' banking records. So, again, StemExpress won't give us the records, but we got them from the bank.

We now know why StemExpress was hiding these documents. The banking records reveal that StemExpress may have been shredding documents that were directly related to this panel's investigation. The bank records show that payments were made to a shredding company—a shredding company. We looked back at all the records we sought from StemExpress back to 2012, and there is no payments to a shredding company. But when this panel started its investigation and when we started asking for documentation, guess what? You have bank records that show they hired a shredding company. Why hire a shredding company when we were starting our investigation?

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

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi has 3 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Illinois has 16 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. DUFFY. Madam Speaker, there is no cause and no reason why StemExpress would allegedly shred these documents. We both know on both sides of the aisle—though we may have a disagreement on this issue—that when this Congress sends a lawful request to an institution, they are required to provide the documents that are requested. Both sides of the aisle know that when we send a subpoena, those who are subpoenaed are required to provide those documents to us.

So if StemExpress has failed to comply with these requests and these subpoenas, and if they are willing to violate the law in regard to subpoenas to hide information, the question becomes: What laws are they willing to violate in regard to the sale of baby body parts? I think that question deserves to be answered by StemExpress, by this institution, and for the American people.

So I would ask support for this additional funding to complete this investigation and provide documentation to this country and to this House about what has been taking place in regard to the procurement and sale of fetal tissue.

1. Date of Congressional Action: August 7, 2015.

a. Event: Energy & Commerce Committee letter to StemExpress requesting a briefing.

b. Date of StemExpress Payment to Shred-It Us: August 13, 2015.

2. Date of Congressional Action: August 21, 2015.

a. Event: StemExpress briefing to Energy & Commerce Committee.

b. Date of StemExpress Payment to Shred-It Us: August 13, 2015.

3. Date of Congressional Action: September 17, 2015.

a. Event: Senate Judiciary Committee document request letter to StemExpress.

b. Date of StemExpress Payment to Shred-It Us: September 29, 2015; November 10, 2015; December 10, 2015.

4. Date of Congressional Action: December 17, 2015.

a. Event: Select Investigative Panel document request letter to StemExpress.

b. Date of StemExpress Payment to Shred-It Us: January 12, 2016.

5. Date of Congressional Action: January 15, 2016.

a. Event: StemExpress first production in response to Select Panel document request letter.

b. Date of StemExpress Payment to Shred-It Us: January 12, 2016.

6. Date of Congressional Action: February 9, 2016.

a. Event: StemExpress production in response to Select Panel document request letter.

b. Date of StemExpress Payment to Shred-It Us: January 27, 2016.

7. Date of Congressional Action: February 12, 2016.

a. Event: Select Panel Subpoena to StemExpress.

b. Date of StemExpress Payment to Shred-It Us.

8. Date of Congressional Action: March 28, 2016.

a. Event: StemExpress production in response to Panel subpoena.

b. Date of StemExpress Payment to Shred-It Us: March 21, 2016.

9. Date of Congressional Action: May 10, 2016.

a. Event: StemExpress production in response to Panel subpoena.

b. Date of StemExpress Payment to Shred-It Us: April 26, 2016.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS) who is a new Member. He has served over three decades in the Pennsylvania legislature and now has joined us.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois.

In the short 2 weeks that I have been here, Madam Speaker, I have observed a lot of interesting things take place. But what I especially have observed at this particular point, Madam Speaker, is that the American taxpayers shouldn't be asked to spend another \$800,000 on an unnecessary and dangerous selective investigation.

Don't take my word, Madam Speaker, look at the aspect of quotes from around the United States.

The Tennessean: "Right now, the panel is creating the perception that it is embroiled in a wild goose chase."

The New York Times: "Neither the videos nor the many investigations that followed have found any evidence that Planned Parenthood offered to sell fetal tissue for a profit."

"Elected officials should not use the power of the office to intimidate citizens who hold different points of view."

The New York Times: "Nor is there any reason to conduct this investigation . . . Republicans are pointlessly attacking a practice that could save lives and, in the process, potentially putting researchers' lives at risk."

The Hill: "The committee is abusing its power and the effect is very troubling for researchers and patients alike."

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. EVANS. The fact is Planned Parenthood does not sell fetal tissue for profit and never has. A Republican-led House panel is undeterred and conducting its own investigation and, more accurately, witch hunt. Even more troubling is the considerable time and money that will be wasted on this political damage to health care and medical research.

Madam Speaker, this is not needed. We should be against it.

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

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Today, Republicans are asking taxpayers to spend \$800,000 to cover for their mistakes. The select panel to investigate Planned Parenthood, which was created based on lies spread by anti-abortion extremists, has already overspent the \$1 million this Republican Congress has allocated them with no real find-

ings. Now they want to continue their attack on women and Planned Parenthood. This is outrageous.

This select panel—along with 13 States, three House committees, and a Texas grand jury investigation—has found no wrongdoing on the part of Planned Parenthood. It is clear that, after over a year of investigations, Republicans are not seeking truth or better policy.

Instead, this panel has released confidential documents to the public, compared researchers to Nazi war criminals, and exposed doctors and researchers to harassment and violence. We cannot continue to fund this fruitless witch hunt that endangers our researchers and slows important medical discoveries.

I strongly oppose this committee and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how many additional speakers the minority may have?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, we have six additional speakers and still, I think, some additional time beyond that.

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. The Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives has been investigating potential violations of the Federal law that makes it illegal to sell fetal tissue—that is body parts—for profit. The evidence reveals appalling practices. For example, on video, we saw a Planned Parenthood doctor talking about doing "less crunchy" types of abortion. That was to make sure they had intact body parts to sell.

The gruesome practices the panel discovered shocked the conscience. Where does this end?

Consider this: It was startling to learn that the University of New Mexico had a summer camp program in which students dissected the brains of unborn children. According to documents obtained by the panel, the university ordered from a late-term abortion doctor "whole, fixed brains to dissect with summer camp students."

Think about that. We are talking about students—teenagers—dissecting the brains of someone within the age group of their own siblings. What barbarity are we teaching our children? How seared have our consciences become?

The select panel must move forward with its investigation into these alarming violations of law and assaults on human dignity and conscience.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ) who is a doctor.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 933. I oppose funding for the select panel to attack and intimidate women's health care.

The select panel is a baseless committee formed with no regard to the

facts or evidence of this case. In fact, the creators of the purposefully doctored and highly manipulated videos that they consistently bring up that this investigation is based on have been indicted on criminal felony charges, and we should be investigating their legal practices instead. Continuing to fund this panel is a disgrace, and this investigation must cease immediately.

Instead of taking action that would improve the lives of women and families across the country, this panel continues to chase baseless allegations.

As an emergency physician, I am exceptionally disappointed. The reckless work of the panel puts women's reproductive rights in jeopardy and threatens to undo the progress we have made over the last 40 years. It is also a complete waste of taxpayer money.

I stand in strong opposition to this resolution and call on this panel to be disbanded. Let's take real action to improve the health and well-being of this country.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) who is my friend.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strident opposition to H. Res. 933.

Madam Speaker, we have heard so much about fake news lately, and now we are being asked for taxpayer funding for fake congressional committees. This resolution provides another 800,000 taxpayer dollars to the Republicans' ongoing hatchet job against Planned Parenthood. We already know the facts on the faked Planned Parenthood videos and the unethical videographer. The fake committee's only goal is to create Orwellian unfacts.

So far, this fake committee has found no wrongdoing by Planned Parenthood or their doctors. Of course, this panel knows that they wouldn't find anything because Planned Parenthood has been cleared of wrongdoing 17 times by three different House committees, 17 State investigations, and a grand jury.

Now, despite all this, Republicans want to waste more taxpayer dollars.

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

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, despite all this, Republicans want to waste more taxpayer dollars for their smear campaign, money that could be used on meaningful measures to reduce infant mortality, feed hungry children, or improve early childhood education. What we really need to get to the bottom of is: What will it take to get Republicans to get the target off women's backs?

Do that, and we might actually make some progress.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for her leadership and for yielding.

Let's just be clear. We know what this is. This is yet another attempt to fund with Federal taxpayer dollars a Republican messaging effort to attack Planned Parenthood.

More than 2.5 million people—2.5 million women—every year rely on Planned Parenthood for lifesaving cancer screenings and for other health services. We have important legislative work to do, and we ought not be using taxpayer dollars to fund this effort which has clearly been described in all sorts of lofty tones but is essentially a political witch hunt after an organization that provides essential services to women.

The majority cannot deny the chilling effect that this effort has had on medical research. It has already been revealed that this is also an attack on stem cell research. You just have to listen to the debate.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KILDEE. We need to make sure that we are pursuing scientific research to fight diseases like diabetes, like Alzheimer's, and like multiple sclerosis, a disease my wife, Jennifer, has been fighting for 18 years.

□ 1545

We are one of those families that, when we hear about medical research and we hear about stem cell research, in particular, our ears perk up because we know there is hope in that research.

This effort—no matter what anybody wants to say, it is well documented—has had a chilling effect on that medical research, and we ought to shut this down.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is time to move on from this dangerous, partisan, and wasteful investigation into Planned Parenthood. This case is closed—after investigations with 13 States, three House committees, and a Texas Grand Jury that found no wrongdoing by Planned Parenthood.

The majority wants \$1.5 million from the American taxpayers to fund this dangerous sham when they know that they will never find evidence of wrongdoing by Planned Parenthood.

But the evidence doesn't matter, Madam Speaker. The majority knows that, if they keep this farce in the headlines, it will do real damage to women seeking health care. They know that it will feed fake news sites on the Internet. They know that it will block women from exercising their constitutional rights. And they know that it

will unfairly harass women's health clinics. Madam Speaker, they know that this will put abortion providers and their staff in danger.

This panel serves no true investigatory purpose. It is a political tool. It is a disgrace.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, if I could inquire how much time I have left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Illinois has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY for yielding and for her tremendous leadership on this issue and so many issues that affect women.

I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 933, which is nothing more than a politically motivated resolution. It would shamefully—shamefully—provide an additional \$800,000 to the select investigative panel to so-called investigate Planned Parenthood and attack women's health.

Republicans are asking for more money to continue their baseless attacks to undermine medical and scientific research and intimidate and harass providers. How outrageous. Let's be clear. This is yet another attempt to deny women, especially low-income women, access to health care.

There have been multiple hearings and there have been committee investigations, none of which have resulted in any evidence of wrongdoing by Planned Parenthood, doctors, or researchers.

Madam Speaker, this resolution and the absurd select panel investigation amounts to nothing more than a witch hunt. Instead of wasting millions of taxpayer dollars on this smear campaign, we should be fully investing in women's health and childcare.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this dangerous resolution and, instead, call for an end of the select panel to attack women's health.

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

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I join my Democratic colleagues in opposing funding for a legislative panel that, instead of protecting, is jeopardizing life. Just ask the wife and 4 children and 10 grandchildren of George Tiller, a good doctor, who, while attending church, was shot dead by an anti-abortion extremist. His loved ones know the tragic consequences of having a target on one's back. And what this panel is doing is funding and creating new targets.

Reports naming names with bogus accusations; every day, clinics dealing

with social media threats, bomb scares, harassment. We are playing deadly politics here, endangering lives and halting lifesaving medical breakthroughs. Enough is enough.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

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

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

I just want to say a few things before yielding to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY).

We have heard a lot of accusations against certain businesses, et cetera, and institutions, and the Republicans have selectively and repeatedly released documents and letters, including a so-called criminal referral to the New Mexico attorney general, to the press before sending them or sharing them with Democrats. This is clearly a political move.

They have also manufactured their own misleading so-called exhibits and withheld documents and information from Democrats in violation of the House rules. They have abused their power throughout the whole time and should now not be allowed to continue to get any more money for this panel.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I would offer an amendment to the resolution that would abolish the select panel instead of funding it. Let's be done with this once and for all.

Madam Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I also urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H. Res. 933.

I reserved a little bit of my time because I thought that this would be the last time that our chairman, CANDICE MILLER, would be here orchestrating the resolution. Instead we got my dear friend, Mr. HARPER. That is okay. We will take the second.

CANDICE MILLER is going on to other things, and we wish her well. She is on other endeavors, and it is bittersweet. The sweetness is that she is leaving here and going home. The bitterness is that she is leaving here and going home. She has been a great chairman. We have had the pleasure of working together. We agreed 99.9 percent of the time. Without question, she was the classiest lady—without question, the classiest person, not only the classiest lady—in this institution.

Again, I wish her well. And whatever I can do—if I am ever in Michigan, I am going to stop to see her; if she is ever in Philadelphia, she can come to see me; and if she comes back here, I would love to see her again.

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

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

I share that admiration for CANDICE MILLER, who will be leaving at the end of this term. It has been great to see the working relationship that Mr. BRADY and Mrs. MILLER have had together on the Committee on House Administration. It has been an excellent example of how this place can operate.

Let us come together, though, here to fulfill our responsibility to one of the House's standing committees and provide the Committee on Energy and Commerce, both the majority and the minority, the funding that they need to finish their work this year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, the Select Investigative Panel was created solely to attack Planned Parenthood and intimidate women, health care providers, and scientific researchers. Its investigation has never been fair or fact-based.

It is shameful that the Majority is continuing to use the taxpayer's money to advance its own political purposes. This privileged resolution would waste another \$800,000 of the American people's tax dollars on this partisan witch hunt. The Majority is now on track to spend more than \$1.5 billion on this dangerous smear campaign.

Madam Speaker, I call on every Member of the House who does not want to fund witch hunts to support Ms. SCHAKOWSKY's amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary, and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 933, which would increase funding by \$800,000 for the Select Investigative Panel of the Energy and Commerce Committee, which more accurately should be called the "Planned Parenthood Witchhunt."

The ostensible purpose of this Select Investigative Panel is to investigate and report on all issues related to medical procedures and practices involving fetal tissue donation and procurement; federal funding and support for abortion providers; and late-term abortions.

But make no mistake, the Republican majority's real purpose in establishing this panel is (1) to open another front in their ongoing War Against Women, (2) impede women in the exercise of their right to make their own choices when it comes to their reproductive health, and (3) to persecute, smear, and demonize Planned Parenthood.

We know this from our experience with the so-called "Benghazi Committee," which the Republican leadership claimed was a non-partisan inquiry into the facts and circumstances surrounding the 2012 tragedy in Libya which claimed the lives of four brave and heroic Americans.

We know now, as confirmed by the Majority Leader and the Speaker-apparent, that the

Benghazi Committee was in reality part of politically-motivated strategy to disparage and damage the former Secretary of State and leading candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination that wasted \$4.5 million of the taxpayers' money.

Madam Speaker, with so many pressing challenges facing our nation, wasting time and taxpayer money on another partisan witch hunt is a luxury we simply cannot afford.

The structure and powers to be given the Select Investigative Panel does not inspire any confidence that it will operate in a fair and impartial manner.

For example, the composition of the committee is lopsided in favor of the majority (8 Republican; 5 Democrat), instead of more equally divided as select committees are comprised.

Second, the chairman of the select panel is given subpoena power and deposition authority, including the authority to order the taking of depositions by a member of the select panel or the panel's counsel.

Third, the the chairman of the select committee is authorized to recognize members to question witness for periods longer than the traditional five minutes and to recognize staff to question witnesses.

Taken together, these unusual powers are susceptible to abuse and are valued tools to any party wishing to conduct a fishing expedition as opposed to a dispassionate search for facts.

Madam Speaker, let me save our Republican colleagues some time by pointing out the facts that an objective, fair-minded inquiry would reveal.

In 2011, approximately 1.06 million abortions took place in the U.S., down from an estimated 1.21 million abortions in 2008, 1.29 million in 2002, 1.31 million in 2000 and 1.36 million in 1996.

Based on available state-level data, an estimated 984,000 abortions took place in 2013—down from an estimated 1.02 million abortions in 2012.

Fetal tissue research has been scientifically accepted since the Regan Administration.

In 1988 the Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research Panel (or the Blue Ribbon Commission) sought to separate the question of ethics of abortion from the question ethics of using fetal tissue from legal elective abortions for medical research.

The report of this commission laid the foundation for the NIH Health Revitalization Act of 1993 (which passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support), prohibits the payment or receipt of money or any other form of valuable consideration for fetal tissue, regardless of whether the program to which the tissue is being provided is funded or not.

The law contains a limited exception that permits reimbursement for actual expenses (e.g. storage, processing, transportation, etc.) of the tissue.

These fees generally amount to less than \$100.

Less than 1 percent of Planned Parenthood chapters participate in this area of research.

Planned Parenthood reports revenue by source (either government or non-government) rather than the manner of disbursement (income versus grants and contracts).

Payments from Medicaid managed care plans are listed as "Government Health Services Grants and Reimbursements" to reflect the ultimate source of the funds.

Planned Parenthood spends about \$1.1 billion annually on 11.4 million services, 83 percent of which is spent on research, client services and education.

Client services are divided into six categories: Cancer Prevention and Screenings, STI Testing, Contraception, Abortion Services, Other Women's Health Services & Other Services.

According to Planned Parenthood financial statements from 2009 through 2014, 86 percent of Planned Parenthood's Services fall under the categories of Cancer Prevention and Screenings (12–16 percent), STI Testing for men and women (35–41 percent), and Contraception (32–35 percent).

Only about about 3 percent of its services fall under the Abortion category nationally.

Additionally, Planned Parenthood is already prohibited from spending federal funds on abortion services anyway.

Finally, Madam Speaker, H. Res. 933 is an irresponsible diversion from tackling and addressing the following critical challenges facing this Congress and the American people.

Funding to keep the government open expires on December 9 and Congress must find a way to keep the government open in the face of irresponsible opposition from 151 Republicans who previously voted to shut down the government rather than allow women access to affordable family planning and life-saving preventive health care.

Madam Speaker, we have far more important things to do than waste more time and taxpayer money on another partisan attempt to deprive women of their right to make their own decisions regarding their reproductive health that has been recognized as constitutionally guaranteed since 1973 by the Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade*.

I oppose H. Res. 933 and urge all Members to join me in voting against this wasteful and irresponsible measure.

HEALTH IMPACT OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD AFFILIATES BY THE NUMBERS

378,692—Pap tests performed.
 487,029—breast exams performed.
 87,988—women whose cancer was detected early or whose abnormalities were identified.
 865,721—Total Pap tests and breast exams performed.
 1,440,495—emergency contraception kits provided.
 516,000—unintended pregnancies averted by contraceptive services.
 3,577,348—Birth control information and services provided.
 704,079—HIV tests conducted.
 169,008—STIs diagnosed, enabling people to get treatment and to learn how to prevent the further spread of STIs.
 4,470,597—Tests and treatment for sexually transmitted infections provided.
 Planned Parenthood health centers saw 2.7 million patients, who collectively received 10.6 million services during 4.6 million clinical visits.

PARENTHOOD CLIENTS RECEIVING CONTRACEPTIVE SERVICES IN 2013

42 percent—STI/STD Testing & Treatment.
 11 percent—Other Women's Health Services.
 3 percent—Abortion Services.
 1 percent—Other Services.
 9 percent—Cancer Screening and Prevention.
 34 percent—Contraception.

MEDICAL SERVICES PROVIDED BY AFFILIATES (2013)

STI/STD Testing & Treatment Total: 4,470,597.
 STI Tests, Women and Men: 3,727,359.
 Genital Warts (HPV) Treatments: 38,612.

HIV Tests, Women and Men: 704,079.
 Other Treatments: 547.
 Contraception Total: 3,577,348.
 Reversible Contraception Clients, Women 2,131,865.
 Emergency Contraception Kits 1,440,495.
 Female Sterilization Procedures 822.
 Vasectomy Clients 4,166.
 Cancer Screening and Prevention Total: 935,573.
 Pap Tests 378,692.
 HPV Vaccinations 34,739.
 Breast Exams/Breast Care 487,029.
 Colposcopy Procedures 32,334.
 LEEP Procedures 2,095.
 Cryotherapy Procedures 684.
 Other Women's Health Services Total: 1,147,467.
 Pregnancy Tests 1,128,783.
 Prenatal Services 18,684.
 Abortion Services Total: Abortion Procedures 327,653.
 Other Services Total: 131,795.
 Family Practice Services, Women and Men 65,464.
 Adoption Referrals to Other Agencies 1,880.
 Urinary Tract Infections Treatments 47,264.
 Other Procedures, Women and Men 517,187.
 Total of All Services Provided: 10,590,433.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING FOR PLANNED PARENTHOOD

National and Affiliate Chapters (FY2004–FY2014)
 \$4,529,900,000: Amount that Planned Parenthood and its affiliates have received in government funding over the last ten years, according to the organization's annual reports.

This represents less than half, approximately 45 percent, of the organization total revenues.

There are 38 Planned Parenthood locations in Texas.

Planned Parenthood reports revenue by source (either government or non-government) rather than the manner of disbursement (income versus grants and contracts).

Payments from Medicaid managed care plans are listed as "Government Health Services Grants and Reimbursements" to reflect the ultimate source of the funds.

The government funding comes from both federal and state governments.

Government Health Service Grants and Reimbursements:

FY 2014: \$528.5 million.
 FY 2013: \$540.6 million.
 FY 2012: \$542.4 million.
 FY 2011: \$538.5 million.
 FY 2010: \$487.4 million.
 FY 2009: \$363 million.
 FY 2008: \$349.6 million.
 FY 2007: \$336.7 million.
 FY 2006: \$305.3 million.
 FY 2005: \$272.7 million.
 FY 2004: \$265.2 million.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 933 OFFERED BY MS. SCHAKOWSKY

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce established pursuant to House Resolution 461, agreed to October 7, 2015, is hereby terminated.

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.

Mr. HARPER. Madam 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. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1710

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 1, 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 December 1, 2016, at 4:18 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 6297.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 933;

Adoption of House Resolution 933, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 937;

Adoption of House Resolution 937, if ordered;

Adoption of the motion to recommit on H.R. 6392; and

Passage of H.R. 6392, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE IN THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 933) providing amounts for further expenses of the Committee

on Energy and Commerce in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 177, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 594]

YEAS—235

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

NAYS—177

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

NOT VOTING—22

Brown (FL)	Hahn	Poe (TX)
Carney	Jolly	Renacci
Curbelo (FL)	Jones	Simpson
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Vela
Fincher	Lofgren	Westmoreland
Flores	Neal	Williams
Forbes	Nugent	
Garrett	Payne	

□ 1735

Mr. ASHFORD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MULLIN and Ms. GRANGER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 181, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 595]

AYES—234

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

NOES—181

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

Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Costa	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Courtney	Keating	Quigley
Crowley	Kelly (IL)	Rangel
Cuellar	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Cummings	Kildee	Richmond
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny	Kind	Ruiz
DeGette	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Delaney	Langevin	Rush
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	T.
Deutch	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Lee	Levin	Sarbanes
Levin	Lewis	Schakowsky
Lieu, Ted	Lewis	Schiff
Lowenthal	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Lowey	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Lujan Grisham	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
(NM)	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sensenbrenner
(NM)	(NM)	Serrano
Lujan, Ben Ray	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
(NM)	(NM)	Sherman
Lynch	(NM)	Sinema
Maloney,	(NM)	Sires
Carolyn	(NM)	Slaughter
Maloney, Sean	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Matsui	(NM)	Speier
McCollum	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
McDermott	(NM)	Takano
McGovern	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
McNerney	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Meeke	(NM)	Titus
Meng	(NM)	Tonko
Moore	(NM)	Torres
Moulton	(NM)	Tsongas
Murphy (FL)	(NM)	Van Hollen
Nadler	(NM)	Vargas
Napolitano	(NM)	Veasey
Neal	(NM)	Velázquez
Nolan	(NM)	Visclosky
Norcross	(NM)	Walz
O'Rourke	(NM)	Wasserman
Pallone	(NM)	Schultz
Pascrell	(NM)	Waters, Maxine
Payne	(NM)	Watson Coleman
Pelosi	(NM)	Welch
Perlmutter	(NM)	Wilson (FL)
Peters	(NM)	Yarmuth
Pingree	(NM)	

NOT VOTING—19

Brown (FL)	Hahn	Renacci
Carney	Jolly	Stivers
Carney	Jones	Vela
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Westmoreland
Fincher	Lofgren	Williams
Flores	Nugent	
Forbes	Poe (TX)	
Garrett		

□ 1743

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2943, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 937) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (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 for other purposes, 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 235, nays 180, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 596]

YEAS—235

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

NAYS—180

Adams	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Beyer	F.
Ashford	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Bass	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Beatty	Bonamici	Bustos
Becerra		Butterfield

Capps	Higgins	Payne	Bishop (MI)	Heck (NV)	Peterson	Connolly	Jeffries	Pelosi
Capuano	Himes	Pelosi	Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Pingree	Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Cárdenas	Hinojosa	Perlmutter	Black	Herrera Beutler	Pittenger	Crowley	Kaptur	Polis
Cartson (IN)	Honda	Peters	Blackburn	Hice, Jody B.	Pitts	Cummings	Keating	Richmond
Cartwright	Hoyer	Peterson	Blum	Higgins	Poliquin	Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Pingree	Bost	Hill	Pompeo	DeGette	Kennedy	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Israel	Pocan	Boustany	Holding	Posey	Delaney	Kildee	Rush
Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Polis	Brady (TX)	Hoyer	Price (NC)	DeLauro	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Ciilline	Jeffries	Price (NC)	Brat	Hudson	Price, Tom	DelBene	Kuster	Sánchez, Linda
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley	Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Quigley	DeSaulnier	Lawrence	T.
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel	Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Rangel	Deutch	Lee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kaptur	Rice (NY)	Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Ratcliffe	Dingell	Levin	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Keating	Richmond	Brownley (CA)	Hunter	Reed	Doggett	Lewis	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard	Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Reichert	Doyle, Michael	Loeb sack	Schiff
Cohen	Kennedy	Ruiz	Buck	Hurt (VA)	Ribble	F.	Lowenthal	Schrader
Connolly	Kildee	Ruppersberger	Bucshon	Issa	Rice (NY)	Duckworth	Lowey	Serrano
Conyers	Kilmer	Rush	Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Rice (SC)	Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Kind	Ryan (OH)	Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Rigell	Ellison	(NM)	Sherman
Costa	Kuster	Sánchez, Linda	Calvert	Johnson (GA)	Roby	Engel	Luján, Ben Ray	Sires
Courtney	Langevin	T.	Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)	Farr	(NM)	Speier
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Carter (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)	Foster	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes	Chabot	Jordan	Rogers (KY)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney,	Takano
Cummings	Lawrence	Schakowsky	Chaffetz	Joyce	Rohrabacher	Fudge	Carolyn	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lee	Schiff	Clawson (FL)	Katko	Rokita	Gabbard	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Danny	Levin	Schrader	Coffman	Kelly (MS)	Rooney (FL)	Gallego	Matsui	Titus
DeGette	Lewis	Scott (VA)	Cole	Kelly (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Graham	McCollum	Tonko
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David	Collins (GA)	Kilmer	Roskam	Grayson	McDermott	Torres
DeLauro	Lipinski	Serrano	Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Ross	Green, Al	McNerney	Van Hollen
DelBene	Loeb sack	Sewell (AL)	Comer	King (NY)	Rothfus	Green, Gene	Meeks	Vargas
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sherman	Comstock	Kinzinger (IL)	Rouzer	Grijalva	Meng	Velázquez
Dingell	Lowe y	Sinema	Conaway	Kline	Royce	Gutiérrez	Moore	Walsh
Doggett	Lujan Grisham	Sires	Cook	Knight	Ruppersberger	Hanabusa	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Slaughter	Cooper	Labrador	Russell	Hastings	Nadler	Walz
F.	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)	Costa	LaHood	Heck (WA)	Heck (WA)	Napolitano	Wasserman
Duckworth	(NM)	Smith (WA)	Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Himes	Neal	Schultz	Waters, Maxine
Edwards	Lynch	Speier	Courtney	Lamborn	Hinojosa	Nolan	Waters, Maxine	Watson Coleman
Ellison	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)	Cramer	Lance	Honda	O'Rourke	Watson Coleman	Welch
Engel	Carolyn	Takano	Crawford	Schweikert	Huffman	Pallone	Wilson (FL)	Yarmuth
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)	Crenshaw	Larsen (WA)	Israel	Pascrell	Payne	
Esty	Matsui	Thompson (MS)	Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Jackson Lee			
Evans	McCollum	Titus	Culberson	Latta				
Farr	McDermott	Tonko	Curbelo (FL)	Lieu, Ted				
Foster	McGovern	Torres	Davidson	Lipinski				
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Tsongas	Davis (CA)	LoBiondo				
Fudge	Meeks	Van Hollen	Davis, Rodney	Long				
Gabbard	Meng	Vargas	Denham	Loudermilk				
Gallego	Moore	Veasey	Dent	Love				
Garamendi	Moulton	Velázquez	DeSantis	Lucas				
Graham	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky	DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer				
Grayson	Nadler	Walz	DesJarlais	Lummis				
Green, Al	Napolitano	Wasserman	Diaz-Balart	Dold				
Green, Gene	Neal	Schultz	Dold	MacArthur				
Grijalva	Nolan	Waters, Maxine	Donovan	Marchant				
Gutiérrez	Norcross	Watson Coleman	Duffy	Marino				
Hanabusa	O'Rourke	Welch	Duncan (SC)	Massie				
Hastings	Pallone	Wilson (FL)	Duncan (TN)	McCarthy				
Heck (WA)	Pascrell	Yarmuth	Ellmers (NC)	McCaul				
			Emmer (MN)	McCintock				

NOT VOTING—18

Brown (FL)	Garrett	Nugent
Carney	Hahn	Poe (TX)
DeFazio	Jolly	Renacci
Fincher	Jones	Vela
Flores	Kirkpatrick	Westmoreland
Forbes	Lofgren	Williams

□ 1757

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.

SYSTEMIC RISK DESIGNATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today, the unfinished business is the question on the motion to recommit to the bill (H.R. 6392) to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), 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 178, nays 236, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 598] YEAS—178

Adams	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Beyer	F.
Bass	Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)
Beatty	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)
Becerra	Bonamici	Bustos

NOT VOTING—19

Brown (FL)	Garrett	Poe (TX)
Carney	Hahn	Renacci
DeFazio	Jolly	Vela
DeSaulnier	Jones	Westmoreland
Fincher	Kirkpatrick	Williams
Flores	Lofgren	
Forbes	Nugent	

□ 1750

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BYRNE, Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote. A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, noes 139, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 597] AYES—277

Abraham	Amodei	Barton
Aderholt	Ashford	Benishek
Aguilar	Babin	Beyer
Allen	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amash	Barr	Bishop (GA)

NOES—139

Adams	Brady (PA)	Castro (TX)
Bass	Bustos	Chu, Judy
Beatty	Butterfield	Ciilline
Becerra	Capps	Clark (MA)
Bera	Capuano	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Clay
Bonamici	Carson (IN)	Cleaver
Boyle, Brendan	Cartwright	Clyburn
F.	Castor (FL)	Cohen

Butterfield Hastings
 Capps Heck (WA)
 Capuano Higgins
 Cárdenas Himes
 Carson (IN) Hinojosa
 Cartwright Honda
 Castor (FL) Hoyer
 Castro (TX) Huffman
 Chu, Judy Israel
 Cicilline Jackson Lee
 Clark (MA) Jeffries
 Clarke (NY) Johnson (GA)
 Clay Johnson, E. B.
 Cleaver Kaptur
 Clyburn Keating
 Cohen Kelly (IL)
 Connolly Kennedy
 Conyers Kildee
 Cooper Kilmer
 Costa Kind
 Courtney Kuster
 Crowley Langevin
 Cuellar Larsen (WA)
 Cummings Larson (CT)
 Davis (CA) Lawrence
 DeGette Lee
 Delaney Levin
 DeLauro Lewis
 DelBene Lieu, Ted
 DeSaulnier Lipinski
 Deutch Loeb sack
 Dingell Lowenthal
 Doggett Lujan Grisham
 Doyle, Michael (NM)
 F. Luján, Ben Ray
 Duckworth (NM)
 Edwards Lynch
 Ellison Maloney,
 Engel Carolyn
 Eshoo Maloney, Sean
 Esty Matsui
 Evans McCollum
 Farr McDermott
 Foster McGovern
 Frankel (FL) Mc Nerney
 Fudge Meeks
 Gabbard Meng
 Gallego Moore
 Garamendi Moulton
 Graham Murphy (FL)
 Grayson Nadler
 Green, Al Napolitano
 Green, Gene Neal
 Grijalva Nolan
 Gutiérrez Norcross
 Hanabusa O'Rourke

Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 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)
 Sherman
 Sires
 Slaughter
 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
 Yarmuth

Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Royce
 Russell
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amash
 Amodei
 Ashford
 Babin
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Billrakis
 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)
 Comer
 Comstock

NOT VOTING—20

Barletta
 Brown (FL)
 Carney
 DeFazio
 Fincher
 Flores
 Forbes
 Garrett
 Hahn
 Jolly
 Jones
 Kirkpatrick
 Lofgren
 McHenry

DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Dold
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers (NC)
 Emmer (MN)
 Farenthold
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Fortenberry
 Foye
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Gene
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guinta
 Guthrie
 Hanna
 Hardy
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins
 Hill
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurt (VA)
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger (IL)

□ 1805

Ms. WILSON of Florida changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam 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 254, nays 161, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 599]

YEAS—254

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)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Collins (NY)
 Dent
 DeSantis
 Dent
 DeSantis
 Collins (NY)
 Dent
 DeSantis

NAYS—161

Adams
 Aguilar
 Bass
 Becerra
 Bera
 Beyer
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael F.
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Evans
 Farr
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hanabusa
 Hastings
 Heck (WA)
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Loeb sack
 Lowenthal
 Lowey

Lujan Grisham (NM)	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Pingree	Speier
Lynch	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)
Maloney, Carolyn	Polis	Takano
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Matsui	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
McCollum	Rangel	Titus
McDermott	Rice (NY)	Tonko
McGovern	Richmond	Torres
McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Meng	Ruiz	Van Hollen
Moore	Ruppersberger	Vargas
Moulton	Rush	Veasey
Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez
Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda T.	Visclosky
Neal	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz
Nolan	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Norcross	Schakowsky	Schultz
O'Rourke	Schiff	Waters, Maxine
Pallone	Schradner	Watson Coleman
Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Welch
Pelosi	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
	Sherman	Yarmuth
	Slaughter	

NOT VOTING—19

Brown (FL)	Hahn	Renacci
Carney	Jolly	Salmon
DeFazio	Jones	Vela
Fincher	Kirkpatrick	Westmoreland
Flores	Lofgren	Williams
Forbes	Nugent	
Garrett	Poe (TX)	

□ 1815

Ms. GRAHAM changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION OF THE RIGHT OF TRIBES TO STOP THE EXPORT OF CULTURAL AND TRADITIONAL PATRIMONY RESOLUTION

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 122) supporting efforts to stop the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians in the United States and internationally, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendments:

(1) Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This concurrent resolution may be cited as the “Protection of the Right of Tribes to Stop the Export of Cultural and Traditional Patrimony Resolution” or the “PROTECT Patrimony Resolution”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this resolution:

(1) **NATIVE AMERICAN.**—The term “Native American” means—

(A) with respect to an individual, an individual who is a member of an Indian tribe (as defined in section 2 of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001)); and

(B) with respect to the cultural nature or significance of an item, right, or other object or concept, being of or significant to—

(i) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 2 of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001)); or

(ii) a Native Hawaiian organization (as defined in that section (25 U.S.C. 3001)).

(2) **TRIBAL CULTURAL ITEM.**—The term “tribal cultural item” has the meaning given the term “cultural item” in section 2 of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001).

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Tribal cultural items—

(A) have ongoing historical, traditional, or cultural importance central to a Native American group or culture;

(B) cannot be alienated, appropriated, or conveyed by any individual; and

(C) are vital to Native American cultural survival and the maintenance of Native American ways of life.

(2) The nature and description of tribal cultural items are sensitive and to be treated with respect and confidentiality, as appropriate.

(3) Violators often export tribal cultural items internationally with the intent of evading Federal and tribal laws.

(4) Tribal cultural items continue to be removed from the possession of Native Americans and sold in black or public markets in violation of Federal and tribal laws, including laws designed to protect Native American cultural property rights.

(5) The illegal trade of tribal cultural items involves a sophisticated and lucrative black market, where the items are traded through domestic markets and then are often exported internationally.

(6) Auction houses in foreign countries have held sales of tribal cultural items from the Pueblo of Acoma, the Pueblo of Laguna, the Pueblo of San Felipe, the Hopi Tribe, and other Indian tribes.

(7) After tribal cultural items are exported internationally, Native Americans have difficulty stopping the sale of the items and securing their repatriation to their home communities, where the items belong.

(8) Federal agencies have a responsibility to consult with Native Americans to stop the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items.

(9) An increase in the investigation and successful prosecution of violations of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa et seq.) is necessary to deter illegal trading in tribal cultural items.

(10) Many Indian tribes and tribal organizations have passed resolutions condemning the theft and sale of tribal cultural items, including the following:

(A) The National Congress of American Indians passed Resolutions SAC-12-008 and SD-15-075 to call on the United States, in consultation with Native Americans—

(i) to address international repatriation; and

(ii) to take affirmative actions to stop the theft and illegal sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and internationally.

(B) The All Pueblo Council of Governors, representative of 20 Pueblo Indian tribes—

(i) noted that the Pueblo Indian tribes of the Southwestern United States have been disproportionately affected by the sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and internationally in violation of Federal and tribal laws; and

(ii) passed Resolutions 2015-12 and 2015-13 to call on the United States, in consultation with Native Americans—

(I) to address international repatriation; and

(II) to take affirmative actions to stop the theft and illegal sale of tribal cultural items both domestically and internationally.

(C) The United South and Eastern Tribes, an intertribal organization comprised of 26 feder-

ally recognized Indian tribes, passed Resolution 2015:007, which calls on the United States to address all means to support the repatriation of tribal cultural items from beyond United States borders.

(D) The Inter-Tribal Council of the Five Civilized Tribes, uniting the Chickasaw, Choctaw, Cherokee, Muscogee (Creek), and Seminole Nations, passed Resolution 12-07, which requests that the United States, after consultation with Native Americans, assist in international repatriation and take immediate action to address repatriation.

SEC. 4. DECLARATION OF CONGRESS.

Congress—

(1) condemns the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items;

(2) calls on the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Attorney General to consult with Native Americans, including traditional Native American religious leaders, in addressing the practices described in paragraph (1)—

(A) to take affirmative action to stop the practices; and

(B) to secure repatriation of tribal cultural items to Native Americans;

(3) supports the efforts of the Comptroller General of the United States—

(A) to determine the scope of illegal trafficking in tribal cultural items domestically and internationally; and

(B) to discuss with Native Americans, including traditional Native American religious leaders, relevant Federal officials, and other individuals and entities, as appropriate, the steps required—

(i) to end illegal trafficking in, and the export of, tribal cultural items; and

(ii) to secure repatriation of tribal cultural items to the appropriate Native Americans;

(4) supports the development of explicit restrictions on the export of tribal cultural items; and

(5) encourages State and local governments and interested groups and organizations to work cooperatively in—

(A) deterring the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items; and

(B) securing the repatriation of tribal cultural items to the appropriate Native Americans.

(2) Strike the preamble.

Mr. GOODLATTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Senate amendments.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS SATURDAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Small Business Saturday this past weekend, a day to support small businesses and celebrate the role that they play in our communities. This year, Small Business Saturday saw a record 112 million shoppers, a number which

highlights the effectiveness of this movement across the United States.

Small businesses have proven time and time again that they are the backbone of a strong economy. In Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, which I am proud to represent, small businesses provide valuable services, ranging from construction and manufacturing to health care and social assistance, bettering the lives of residents and consumers.

Academic institutions also play an important role in growing small businesses. For example, Penn State University introduced a business preaccelerator this year, known as the Happy Valley Launchbox. This unique venture is a signature program of the Invent Penn State initiative, and I am confident it will serve as a platform for entrepreneurship and innovation.

I look forward to the continued success of small businesses both in Pennsylvania and across the United States, and I remain grateful for their contribution to our Nation's economy.

IMPROVING THE HEALTH OF AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 21st Century Cures Act that passed yesterday. It is not too often that we get to be proactive in such important legislative business in this House. However, yesterday we saw a great victory for the families that so many of us have heard from. We have heard from mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, and aunts and uncles about loved ones who are dealing with mental illness or dealing with drug addiction or dealing with a disease that we haven't been able to accurately address because we have had roadblocks because of legislation and rules that have been put in place by the FDA. But yesterday we got to pass a piece of legislation by overwhelming bipartisan support to say: Yes, we are listening; yes, we hear you; and yes, we are going to make changes.

I am going to let my other colleagues speak. At this time I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), my chairman.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and heading up this very important Special Order on a topic that affects every single family in America, and that is their health.

As the gentleman said, yesterday we passed a very important bill, the 21st Century Cures Act, with the charge led by the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, FRED UPTON. I was pleased that they included in that package our mental health reform bill, which we moved out of the Committee on Energy and Commerce unanimously in July.

We have spoken about this issue at great length for the last few years because it is worthy of that time. We have spoken because of the 60 million Americans who suffer from some level of mental illness and the 10 million Americans who suffer from severe mental illness and the fact that 40 percent of them cannot get care; that half the counties in America have no psychiatrists, psychologists or social workers; that we do not have enough hospital beds for people in crisis, a shortage of 100,000; that there are only 9,000 child and adolescent psychiatrists when we need 30,000, particularly important because severe mental illness in half the cases emerges by age 14 and 75 percent by age 24; that we have seen too many lives lost, that the body count in this Nation last year related primarily and secondarily to mental illness exceeds the total combat body counts of United States soldiers in World War I, Korea, Vietnam, Desert Storm, Bosnia, Afghanistan, and Iraq combined; because millions of families continue to suffer, because our prisons are filled with the mentally ill, our emergency rooms are backed up with people with mental illness-related disorders, and because our morgues are also filled.

Yesterday, the House took a definitive bipartisan approach in changing that trajectory. The issues we have covered on mental health, along with the advances in the 21st Century Cures bill, sets a new direction for where we need to be going in this Nation to approaching health care overall. When we look at the research changes that we have made in advancing cures not only in small population orphan diseases, but also with regard to the total 10,000 diseases out there, we will be able to sufficiently and more effectively identify medical disorders and psychiatric disorders early on and get them treatment sooner.

One of the aspects that was taken care of in the Helping Families With Mental Health Crisis Act is a program called RAISE, Response After Initial Schizophrenic Episode. As we know, research tells us that when you provide medication and effective targeted counseling early on, you can reduce the trajectory of severe mental illness and improve the prognosis greatly. But when that is not provided, every crisis moment of severe mental illness leads to other neurological damage, worsens the prognosis and, sadly, increases the chances that a person will have time in prison 10 times more likely than to be in a hospital when they are in crisis.

We are changing that trajectory. New research will get us in that direction.

Let me lay out for a few minutes today where this takes us as Congress is looking to change the Affordable Care Act. People have spoken ad nauseam about the problems with that act, how it has cost families a great deal, how it is supposed to be affordable but it is not, how premiums have gone up dramatically in double digits and triple digits over the last few years, how the deductibles and copays put it out of families' reach, and how it is not really a comprehensive approach because it does not stem the tide of increasing healthcare costs.

There are some specific reasons for that. As long as we have a system that is based on a fee-for-service model and as long as we have a system that does not put the patient at the center of this focus, we are going to continue to have problems with cost overruns and, quite frankly, care problems.

We have seen changes in the trajectory of improvements in reduction in mortality and morbidity. For example, over the last couple decades, we have seen a reduction in mortality rates for cancer, for heart disease, for stroke, for accidental deaths, for HIV/AIDS; but we have seen increases in mortality rates for suicide and also for drug overdose deaths.

This really means we need to be looking at a different kind of model, and that model is the integrated care model, the model where behavioral medicine and physical medicine work together.

Why is that important?

We know that 75 percent of the people with a severe mental illness will have some other chronic illness like heart disease, lung disease, diabetes, infectious disease; and 50 percent of them have at least two chronic diseases; a third will have at least three. We know that a person with severe mental illness has triple the chance of moving into poverty, and we know that people in poverty have three times the rate of mental illness.

Beyond that, if we look at people who enter into using the medical field from the area of chronic illness, that perhaps the first diagnosis might be anything from cancer, inflammatory bowel disease, diabetes, et cetera, the chances of them developing a psychological problem such as depression, panic disorder, anxiety, is massive, twice the rate of the rest of the population.

This is where the costs begin to soar, because when a person recognizes they have this long-term problem with pain, with doctors' appointments, with disruption of their lifestyle, with immobility, with disability, et cetera, it is expected and it is common for them to develop other psychiatric disorders. But we have had a system that has ignored that.

What happens when we ignore that?

If a person has a chronic illness and depression, for example, untreated depression, it doubles. It doubles their healthcare costs. When there are models out there, however, that say let's

integrate behavioral medicine and physical medicine so that a physician, being a coordinated care model, when they have a patient with one of those illnesses, a chronic illness, they begin to treat the whole patient, the patient-centered model, the team approach between the doctor and patient there.

□ 1830

What can it do? Well, I want to cite a study done by a young doctor by the name of Jeffrey Brenner, who was out in New Jersey.

You recognize that people with complex health and social issues have these high rates of going to emergency rooms. They are called super-utilizers. Medicaid points out that 5 percent of the people on Medicaid account for 50 percent of Medicaid spending and, I might add, virtually all of those are people who have a concurrent psychiatric disorder, such as depression.

But what Brenner did in his particular study is recognize that there were a number of people who had a huge number of visits to emergency rooms in a very costly way. He said, for example, nearly half of the city of Camden's 77,000 residents were visiting an emergency department annually, most often for head colds, viral infections, ear infections, and sore throats. Thirteen percent of the patients accounted for 80 percent of hospital costs, and 20 percent of the patients accounted for 90 percent of the costs.

What he looked at were models that police use called hot spotting—where are the areas of a city where you have a great deal of crime, and, instead of avoiding those areas, the police would go in and work to prevent crime. Well, similarly, in Brenner's model, he looked at managing these patients' care instead of ignoring them. If you ignore them, they go to emergency rooms repeatedly.

Studies done, for example, at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center with inflammatory bowel disease found when you ignore folks, they continue to go to emergency rooms. Over-utilizers of the system. And on a fee-for-service model, it is worth it for the doctor. They made a lot of money. Hospitals made money, as long as the people continued to come back.

But what was it that was driving people repeatedly to get this care at an emergency room, or expensive care, instead of doing something else? What Brenner did and other studies have found is that people could not access their primary care physician or their specialist, so that is where they would go for care. They would panic. Worry, anxiety, depression. They weren't managing their medication well. There are neurobiological things that take place in the system of someone with depression which makes them more prone toward other infections and viruses, et cetera.

What Brenner did was identified folks with a fairly complicated model here and developed a care management

team where the goal is leaving patients with the ability to manage health care on their own. And how do they do that? By helping them see doctors more frequently.

The studies done with the inflammatory bowel disease clinic at the University of Pittsburgh did the same thing. They developed an integrative care team, including psychiatric and psychological consulting, to help the person deal with their pain, help them change their behavior patterns, and make sure they had easy access to the doctors, so even getting the doctor's cell phone number, email address, and respond within 72 hours for doctor visits.

What Brenner found, the first 36 patients had a total of 62 hospital emergency room visits per month before they began intervention. It dropped to 37 visits per month afterwards. Then they also found the hospital bill fell from a monthly average of \$1.2 million to just over \$500,000, savings that benefited State and Federal healthcare plans. Similar results have been found in other areas when this is targeted.

Now, we know the Affordable Care Act had some models of this, but the results have been somewhat equivocal because they haven't looked at these as closely and really worked with the patients as closely. But the point is this: Recognizing if we are going to get hold of the cost overruns with health care, it needs to be that integrated care model—behavioral and physical medicine working together—a coordinated care model, where a primary care physician and/or the specialists are working to coordinate the patient's care instead of leaving them on their own, and, quite frankly, a capitated care model, where it is worth it financially for the physician and patient to work together, not to just say: Go to the hospital whenever you want; go to the emergency room whenever you want; but get the care you need, the time you need it, with the quality you need.

The Affordable Care Act started down this road, but it wasn't fully followed. But this bill we passed yesterday, and our hope is that the Senate passes next week, by moving forward on research; by making sure physicians get timely, quality information for what they should do; by making sure that it is disseminated to physicians, whether they are in urban downtown Manhattan or they are out in rural South Dakota, that through telemedicine they have access to the best decisionmaking; and by making sure that, through telehealth, which we funded in the Helping Families with Mental Health Crisis Act, no matter where physicians are in America, to have access to psychologists and psychiatrists and social workers and to integrate that care together, this is what makes a huge difference.

Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh did a study of when that behavioral health consultation is done during the pediatrician visit, when there is a warm

handoff, right away the family meets the mental health professional, there is over a 90-percent followup for that patient with the doctor. When they are given a card and said to call another day, it plummets to less than half.

Similarly, look at the problems we face with opioid abuse in America. Last year, we had a death total of 47,000. We are reaching the point of the number of people who die from opioid substance abuse is reaching that of the level of our combat deaths during the entire Vietnam war. It is an embarrassing, shameful, and painful thing for our Nation to have, and that doesn't even include the many, many folks who still remain addicted.

But here is what happens with care for the addicted. Out of every 1,000 persons who has an addiction disorder, 900 will not seek care. Of the 100 who do seek care, 37 can't find it. It is not available in their community. Of the 63 who do seek care and find it, only 6 of them will find evidence-based care.

But what if we change that trajectory? What if we say as part of moving forward in our revision of the Affordable Care Act and making it really effective health care we made sure we integrated behavioral and physical medicine together?

A study done at the University of Michigan, I believe, or Michigan State—I have to make sure I get those right because I know Chairman UPTON would not forgive me, but let's say it was done in Michigan—they did a fascinating study where they made sure when someone came to the emergency room with a drug overdose, they didn't do the typical thing and hand someone a card and say: you know, you have a drug problem; you need to go get help. In those cases, many times the vast majority of people don't follow up.

Instead, what they did is they provided qualified drug counseling in the emergency room. From the same model, if a person had a broken arm, the hospital would set it before they went home. They wouldn't say: here is a card; call an orthopedic surgeon on Monday and get that arm set. If a person came in with chest pains, they wouldn't say: why don't you make an appointment in a week or two with a cardiologist. They would treat it right away. Well, the same thing goes with psychiatric disorders and drug abuse.

What Michigan found in their study and replicated in other communities is there was a 50-percent increase of people following through on drug treatment.

So look at the things that are done. The bill we passed yesterday also invests hundreds of millions of dollars into more effective treatment for people with a substance abuse problem. It isn't enough just to have them in methadone maintenance or buprenorphine programs. Those will not be as effective. You have got to get them into effective counseling programs.

So what we see is this: The bipartisan efforts that have worked through

here and have made some big differences in where we are going with research and care will set us on a strong trajectory to making a big difference as this Congress and the new President work to change the Affordable Care Act to really being affordable and really being care-focused.

That being said, we will still have, tragically, too many stories while we are waiting to get that care out there. We will still have too many episodes: a homicide, or a suicide, or a drug overdose death, or someone has lost their job, or a marriage is broken up, or families who have been abandoned by someone else, or children who are lost, or those who are homeless. It continues on as long as we are not properly addressing the issues of mental illness in America.

I tell you, even though we have those long, somber moments of sadness, there is some joy in what this House did yesterday in this strong, bipartisan, coordinated effort to say we are changing the direction of how we recognize mental health care, what we are going to do about that, and how that has to be an integral component as we move forward to change health overall. We can do this. We can reduce costs dramatically by providing better and more effective care.

So for all those families who have been contacting us Members of Congress, literally the millions of Americans who are suffering from these diseases of mental illness and the tens of millions of families who recognize the suffering there, help is on its way. The actions that Congress took yesterday, the actions that we anticipate the Senate will take next week, the signature of the President will move these things forward. We will create a new dawn, a brighter horizon for people who, up to this point, had very little hope of where things are.

We know we have a long way to go, and we know this next Congress, as we move into the next session next year, is going to have their hands full, but we can do this. And I know there are dedicated people here on both sides of the aisle just waiting and eager to make a big difference for America's families. And where there is help, there is hope.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is extremely passionate about this. He has been the leader and a voice for mental illness for my entire time that I have been up here, which hasn't been that long—only 4 years—but we appreciate his passion and his dedication to this.

Unfortunately, mental illness isn't going away. It is becoming more of a problem. And we, as Members of Congress, are going to have to address this. I look forward to continuing to work with the chairman on this.

Yesterday was a step in the right direction, but we have a long way to go. We are in this fight, and we are in this fight together. I couldn't imagine being

with anyone better than the gentleman from Pennsylvania. So I thank him for his dedication.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Before the chairman of our committee steps away, I just want to acknowledge the leadership that Congressman MURPHY of Pennsylvania has given to this issue—an issue that so many Members of Congress haven't talked about enough until he began talking about it.

I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), for leading this Special Order. We have heard from our constituents, and we know families where 1 in 4 adults—a total of 61.5 million Americans—will struggle with mental illness in any given year. While the numbers are staggering—and certainly, my colleague from Pennsylvania knows the numbers and statistics better than maybe this Chamber combined—they don't actually tell the deeply personal and typically painful stories that this disease inflicts on those it touches, their friends, neighbors, and families.

Whether it was Columbine, Aurora, or Sandy Hook, time and time again, tragedies have left our communities devastated and reeling, wondering if our fellow citizens could have been spared the violence and bloodshed had we simply been able to see the signs of mental illness.

Many lessons followed in the wake of all of these tragedies, but chief among them always came out the fact that our mental health system is broken: we are unable to fully recognize the signs and symptoms of an individual suffering from mental illness; we often don't have the resources to help these individuals and their families; and we have very limited mental health workforce, which is overwhelmed and often underprepared for the vast challenges they face day in and day out.

Mental illness is sometimes referred to as an invisible illness. However, just because you can't see the illness, it doesn't mean it isn't there. It is a serious disease, and in order to make any progress in more effectively identifying it, we must begin to recognize it as such.

Before the end of this year, we have a chance to make the first major mental health reforms this country has seen in over 50 years. And I am very proud to stand with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in support of his years of tireless work to bring to the forefront this health crisis we are facing in America—a crisis often pushed to the side because it may be too difficult or too uncomfortable to talk about. I applaud his efforts and the efforts of so many from our committee, particularly the staff, who have made it possible to work to include these important reforms to our mental health system in the critical 21st Century Cures bill that passed the House last night overwhelmingly.

Right now, our medical system does not allow families of those suffering

from mental illness to become true partners in their care. The language in our bill takes significant steps toward easing these barriers and making sure that people struggling with mental illness will have more access to the care and treatment that they need.

Our prisons and emergency rooms have become de facto psychiatric treatment centers and are overcrowded with individuals suffering from mental illness; however, we have learned over the years we cannot simply arrest away this problem. I am pleased that there are reforms to the way our criminal justice system handles individuals with mental illness. As someone who has worked in the criminal justice system most of my career, I can assess that such support is long overdue and so very necessary.

One of the greatest issues with our mental health system is there is a critical shortage, as Dr. Murphy just mentioned, in our mental health workforce. This effort contains significant measures to train and expand this critically important workforce.

□ 1845

These are simply a few of the important reforms included in 21st Century Cures which, above all else, sets a new and higher standard for mental health care and treatment in America.

Once again, I applaud Congressman MURPHY's incredible work to fix our broken mental health care system. I am proud to have supported this effort throughout the legislative process and look to the Senate to now take up the 21st Century Cures and bring relief to the individuals and families across America who need it the most.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to have people that are willing to come down and share their time and their passion with us, so I would like to thank my colleague from Indiana for laying it out in such an eloquent form like she always does.

Also, congratulations on the committee assignment. I don't know if I wish the gentlewoman good luck or not.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding on what is an incredibly important topic.

I also want to weigh in and thank my good friend, Dr. TIM MURPHY, for his incredible work on a really comprehensive piece of mental health legislation. I want to not only congratulate him, I want to thank him for successfully shepherding this first real piece of mental health legislation, honestly, since 1962. It is now up to the Senate to move this forward.

I am pleased to be here as not only an original cosponsor, but helped introduce the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, which was now attached to this recent 21st Century Cures bill, another bill that I am proud to not only stand up and support.

As we look at cures, as we look at what we are doing, we see so much tension across our country today. We just got done with a national election, and, frankly, it seems as people are at each others' throats. And the one thing that we can agree on, I hope, regardless of whom you voted for, we should all be on the same page that we want 21st Century Cures to move forward; because, frankly, as we look at the number of people that are suffering from diabetes, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and the like, they don't care what political persuasion you are. They are just impacting families all across our country.

Another huge piece of that is mental health; and as we look at mental health, there is no question, family after family, an enormous number of people, nearly 10 million Americans, suffer from a serious mental health issue, including schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, major depression, amongst others. Yet millions of these people are going without treatment, and their families are struggling to care for them each and every day.

We need to talk about treatment. Treatment before tragedy is something that I know has been talked about time and again.

The Federal Government currently dedicates about \$130 billion towards 112 programs intended to address mental health, but there is still a nationwide shortage of nearly 100,000 beds needed for psychiatric care and only one child and adolescent psychiatrist for every 2,000 children with a mental health disorder. Frankly, that is just unacceptable.

My constituents have come to me time and again demanding that we do better. The Filler Foundation comes to mind as something that we have to do because, again, as we look at mental health, one of the things that we know is tied to that is this incredible epidemic of prescription drugs and opiates that are really just impacting every single community across our country. Ultimately, we know that this mental health disorder is a huge part of that, as people are trying to self-medicate, and so people are overdosing and dying on a regular basis.

Ultimately, this bill that we are talking about today helps and now allows those families to give better care, be better informed, so that parents or caregivers can actually play a more vital role.

In July, we passed the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, 422-2. And just recently, this other bill that we just passed, the 21st Century Cures, that included this mental health legislation, passed with enormous bipartisan support right here in this body. It is time that the Senate take up this legislation and pass it.

I am confident that the incredible providers that are in my district, the families who are in need that have been asking for help, will benefit from the many grants that we reauthorized, the updates that we have made to improve

communication between the patients, the families, and the providers, and the steps that we took to ensure that insurance providers are complying with existing mental health parity laws.

Over the past 2 years, Dr. Murphy's efforts have engaged Democrats and Republicans from every region of the country. Just a few short months ago, and I am sure—I don't know if he was in Oklahoma with my good friend, but I know he came out to my district. We had a roundtable talking about mental health issues. We went and visited some of the facilities together to talk about the real needs that are out there. Ultimately, we know that mental health impacts so many families across our country.

I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that not a single Member in this body has not been impacted in some way, shape, or form, by a loved one, a friend, a family member that is suffering from some sort of mental illness. So I believe that we have an incredible opportunity here.

Ultimately, when I go out and I talk to people—and I know my good friend, I am sure, has done the same—they say: Is Congress working? And the answer oftentimes is no. But I do think that we have to step back and take a look at what we can accomplish when we actually do come together.

Something that we all should be proud of is the fact that we were able to move forward in this body to talk about not only 21st Century Cures, talking about funding for the National Institutes of Health, talking about trying to deal with some of the prescription drug and opiate epidemics, but really trying to tackle head-on the issue of mental health and the impacts that this has for our Nation.

So I want to thank my good friend from Oklahoma for organizing this Special Order. I want to thank, obviously, my good friend, Dr. MURPHY, for the great work that he has been doing for years on this.

And I do want to make sure that the American people know that today we took a big step forward and, honestly, we are not going to rest until this is signed into law by the President and really enabling so many families to get a tremendous amount of relief.

Mr. MULLIN. I thank the gentleman for his service. My good friend from Illinois is going to be missed. His service has been something we can all hold in great respect. I am going to miss seeing him in the morning at our work-out, but he has influenced us in a better way. If we can always leave where we have been better than we found it, that is a legacy we can all walk with. I thank the gentleman for his service, and I hope our friendship will continue.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend from Illinois was saying about the opioid addiction, I want to point out a sad statistic. Oklahoma is ranked 28th in population throughout the country, and yet we had the 10th highest—10th highest—accidental opioid overdose deaths.

We have more accidental drug overdose deaths caused by painkiller addictions than vehicle accidents in the State of Oklahoma.

And these aren't from the young who may be going through a time of experimenting. This isn't from the elderly who may not understand the prescription which they are taking. This is coming from our mothers. Our number one—number one—individual that is losing their life to opioid overdose is our middle-aged mothers. There is a problem.

The 21st Century Cures does address this, but just the same as mental health, it is a first step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), another good friend of mine, a true patriot to this country, one who has years and years of service. I have a tremendous amount of respect for him.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my friend from the great State of Oklahoma. I am privileged to have visited not only his State, but his district, and met the fabulous and wonderful people there, and they are lucky to have him representing them here.

You talk about that statistic, and I am here to talk specifically about mental illness, but this opioid epidemic has touched every single community. You don't have to live in the city. You don't have to live in underprivileged areas. I know very good friends that it has wracked their families, and it has wracked our communities.

Certainly, one of the great things about the 21st Century Cures Act is the help that is on the way. It is probably not going to be enough, but we need to do everything we can, at least in making these first steps in wrapping our minds and our hands around this problem and getting to a solution.

So I am thankful that the gentleman has taken the time to hold this Special Order, to bring that, as well as the other issues, up, and I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about the mental health situation in our country, and I think the gentleman has alluded to much of it in his conversation.

Mr. Speaker, more than 11 million Americans suffer from severe schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depression, yet millions—literally millions—are going without any treatment whatsoever. And families, these families are struggling to care for these people.

You have a broken arm or some physical malady, you can see that and you can get to a cure in many, many cases. But these mental illnesses vex us, where your loved one is fine one moment and the next moment is not, and you don't know when that is going to happen or the gravity of the situation, how bad it might be at any given moment. These are our loved ones. These are our family members and our neighbors.

The Federal Government's approach to mental health has been a chaotic patchwork of antiquated programs and ineffective policies spread across numerous bureaucratic agencies that simply don't get to the issue at hand, and I think we can all see that.

Sadly, many patients end up in the criminal justice system or are on the street because services are unavailable. I know that in the State that I reside in, the great State of Pennsylvania, years back, we closed our State hospitals where much of the care was given to these people, and they just ended up out on the street or back with their families, which often are cases that their families just don't know what to do. They don't know how to handle it. They can't handle it.

Then these folks end up in the penal system, which is no place for people that justifiably are sick. They have an issue. They are sick. They are not criminals, but they are sick.

In the worst case scenarios, some individuals commit acts of violence. And every one of us has heard the stories and seen the film footage on the news of these acts of violence that can be directly attributable to mental illness.

Now, we should be able to feel safe in our homes, all of us, in our communities, and our hearts just break every single time a senseless act of violence occurs and we see that. And certainly, for parents, these tragedies, they hit especially close to home.

We need to remember that the beneficiaries of mental health treatment aren't only those directly treated for mental illness, but also our broader community when we see those things, those images on TV, because mental health treatment is a preventive measure to reducing acts of violence. It is a preventive measure. It actually stops those things from ever occurring if we get to it.

Now, I was an enthusiastic supporter and cosponsor of my colleague Congressman TIM MURPHY's Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act. He literally worked on it for years, and I watched him struggle through that. And that bill was actually included in the 21st Century Cures Act, which passed this very House last night.

This legislation coordinates programs across different agencies, those disparate agencies that don't seem to work with one another, where information is siloed. It coordinates that, those programs, and promotes effective evidence-based programs, evidence-based so we can get to solutions.

Just like most other things with the Federal Government, by removing Federal barriers to care, advancing early intervention programs, adding alternatives to institutionalization, and improving the transition from one level of care to another, we directly address our Nation's broken mental health care system, finally. Finally, a step in the right direction.

So, once again, I applaud and thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for al-

lowing me this time and bringing this issue to the floor; and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to send this bill directly to the President's desk, absolutely, as soon as possible. We can't wait for another tragedy to occur where we are all watching on television the footage of something that could have been prevented and avoided.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for also being extremely passionate about moving in the right direction with mental health. It is something that we continue to look over.

As I stated when we first started tonight, we had an overwhelming amount of bipartisan support on passing the 21st Century Cures Act. We could see that the hard work that the staff over in the Energy and Commerce Committee, on both sides, the Republican staff and the Democratic staff, worked together to come up with a bipartisan bill to make sure that we are putting our families first, that we are putting our constituents first.

□ 1900

We are setting aside the partisanship that often finds its way inside our conversations. We set it aside and actually were very proactive on a very important piece of legislation.

I would like to thank Chairman MURPHY, with his passion on mental health, and our outgoing chairman, Mr. FRED UPTON, who has dedicated his years of service to the betterment of our constituents and his passion for fighting this and seeing this through. I would like to thank him for his dedication. The gentleman will be missed as our chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I see no other speakers at this time. I yield back the balance of my time.

CELEBRATING THE DREAMERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the stories of and celebrate the DREAMers who live in our communities, mine in El Paso, Texas, and nearly every single community across the great United States.

All together, we estimate there are close to 750,000 DREAMers in the United States. These are beneficiaries of an executive action under this President, known as the Deferred Action for

Childhood Arrivals, that ensured that young people in our communities who arrived in this country at a very early age, brought here by their parents from another country of origin, who are going to school, living by our laws, being productive and net contributors to their communities, and who, in some cases, strive to serve in the military or perform some other community or civic service, are able to reside in this country after they come forward voluntarily out of the shadows to give their personal information, their fingerprints, their contact information, their names, their addresses, and their telephone numbers, in other words, to register with the government so that we know who is in this country and satisfy some legitimate security concerns that we have when it comes to undocumented immigration. So these young DREAMers have satisfied those concerns by coming forward.

This temporary reprieve from deportation allows them to continue to live in our communities, to continue to be our neighbors, to continue to make this country great, and to make cities like El Paso the safe and wonderful communities that they are. It is no accident that El Paso has more than its fair share of DREAMers and also is the safest city not just along the U.S.-Mexico border, it is the safest city not just in the State of Texas, but it is the safest city in the United States today.

The urgency behind our actions today lies with the commitment from the President-elect to immediately terminate the current President's executive actions when it comes to these DREAMers. This commitment to terminate this action will also terminate any certainty these young people have. It will reduce the security of our communities when young people no longer feel comfortable approaching or working with law enforcement for fear of deportation; and it produces extreme anxiety and fear that I can only begin to imagine for myself or for my kids if I knew that I had given all of my personal identifiable information, including the address at which I reside, my telephone number, and the names of my parents, to the Federal Government which now may have a policy to immediately deport me back to the country of origin and, if I were, as a typical DREAMer might be, 20 years old and attending the University of Texas in El Paso, may have lived in El Paso for the majority of my life. I may have come over at the age of 3, and for the last 17 years, the only life I knew was in the United States; the only city I knew was in El Paso, Texas; the only language I spoke was English. I had no family, no connections, no place in my country of original origin, and I didn't speak the language. Then I would be unable to thrive.

I think for some of these young people, they question whether they will have the ability to survive. I think it is really that critical, and it is very important that we remind ourselves, the

rest of the country, and certainly our colleagues here in the House of the gravity of the situation.

Beyond the moral imperative, which I think is the most important, there is also an economic dynamic to this. The Department of Commerce estimates that the DREAMers, these 750,000-strong DREAMers who are contributing every single day in our communities, going to our high schools and making our country better, that over their lifetimes in the United States they will earn up to \$4 trillion of taxable income—taxable income that will allow the community they live in to flourish, to thrive, to enrich those that they hire and work with, and to add significantly to the Federal Treasury.

That is just one point in terms of the economic advantage of creating additional certainty and, at a minimum, not forcibly removing these DREAMers or terminating the protection under which they currently reside.

Before I yield to my colleagues to share their stories about the DREAMers in their communities—and, again, they are in every single State of the Union and almost every community in every one of those States—I thought I would share the story of one of the DREAMers that I met this Monday in El Paso, Texas, when I held a townhall on short notice, a few days' notice to my constituents over Facebook and Twitter and published in the newspaper.

More than 300 El Pasoans showed up to share their stories of how they came to this country and what they are now doing in our communities. What was even more impressive and poignant for me and many in the audience that night were the U.S. citizens in El Paso who showed up to stand in solidarity and in strength with these DREAMers and to let them know that, come what may, whatever executive actions are terminated, whatever necessary immigration reform laws are not enacted, that we as a community in El Paso, Texas, are going to stand with these DREAMers, make sure that they are successful, and make sure that they have nothing to fear going forward.

One of these DREAMers that had the courage to stand up and be counted on Monday night was Estefania Garcia Ruvalcaba. She is 17 years old. She arrived in the United States in El Paso, Texas, which has served as the Ellis Island for much of the Western Hemisphere, at the age of 3 years old. I ask you to tell me what 3-year-old understands concepts like citizenship or nationality.

She doesn't speak the Spanish language anymore that she barely knew at the age of 3. She only speaks English. She is a junior at Del Valle High School in El Paso. She is captain of the soccer team. She is on the student council. She is the press box manager, and so she is earning a little bit of money to be able to take home at the end of the day and help out; and she goes to every single football game to

be able to support the hometown and home high school team. On top of that, she runs on the cross-country team.

My 8-year-old daughter, Molly O'Rourke, has an example in Estefania. I want Molly to be able to do all those things. I am proud of Estefania. She is part of what makes El Paso such a wonderful place to live and what makes me so proud to represent the community and helps us, again, stay the safest city in America, bar none.

There are 750,000-plus Estefanias who have come forward to register with their government to make sure that we know that they are in our communities to defer the action that otherwise would deport them back to their countries of origin and to make this country successful.

At this time, I yield to a good friend and colleague from the great State of Texas, who understands these issues just as well as anyone, who has thousands of DREAMers in his community, and whom I am so grateful to for being here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I thank Congressman O'ROURKE. I thank the gentleman for all of his work on behalf of these DREAMers, these young students who were brought to the United States through no fault of their own. They have grown up here, many of them knowing no other life except an American life.

President Obama, during his term, was so good to issue an executive action known as DACA to give these folks who were in a legal limbo a chance to participate in American society. So many of them have gone on and are doing great things. DACA allows them to work, to go to school, and, most of all, to not have to live in fear, not have to live in fear of deportation.

As you mentioned, many of these folks are people who were brought here at the age of 3 or 5 or 9 and had no choice about coming. Some of them didn't even realize that they were not American citizens until they had to apply to college or try to get a driver's license or in some other way interact with the government.

There has been a lot of rhetoric over the past few years about immigrants. They have been called rapists, murderers, and criminals. There is so much of that kind of rhetoric that is used when people talk about the border, for example, and even the people that live in our border cities, whether it is El Paso or San Diego or McAllen, Texas. My wife is from the Rio Grande Valley, where you have a high concentration of DREAMers, for example. Sometimes, in all of that rhetoric and ugliness, there is a profound misunderstanding about who these people are. So I thank the gentleman for helping to highlight their stories and, really, for the country, to put a human face to these folks who are good people.

I will tell you, because I know other Members have stories of DREAMers in

their districts, just a quick story about somebody from San Antonio, a young man named Eric Balderas. His story was in the news in the last few years.

Eric was the valedictorian in 2009 of Highlands High School. He was number one in his class at Highlands High School, and he was on the academic decathlon team, student council, and even played varsity soccer. He also received a full scholarship to Harvard University.

While returning to Harvard in 2010 to complete summer research in molecular biology, Eric was detained at the San Antonio International Airport for traveling without acceptable identification. After efforts from Senator DURBIN and the Harvard University president, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services was able to grant him deferred action status. Eric's story, so far, has had a happy ending. He graduated from Harvard in 2013.

There have been other folks who have achieved just as much, who are productive members of our country and our society, but oftentimes they are maligned, and they are often misunderstood.

Right now, we are at a critical moment in our country's history. There is a question hanging over the Nation about how we will treat these DREAMers, these young students, these young people, again, who find themselves in legal limbo, who are as American as we are, and who have only known America as their homeland. There is a big question about what will happen with them.

The President-elect has talked about getting rid of DACA early on, perhaps on the first day in office. So, as I am sure you found, there is a lot of anxiety from these young people and also their families about what is going to happen to them. They have played by the rules; they are being productive; they are working hard; they are going to school; they are paying their taxes; and they are living as Americans.

This will be a real test for the Congress, for the President-elect, who, on January 20, will be the new President, and, really, for the Nation about what kind of nation we are. This really tugs at our conscience.

When we think about some of the rhetoric that has been used—some people call them criminals. They say that they broke the law. I think when I hear that, as an attorney, I think about the different legal standards that we apply in criminal cases. For example, there is something known as mens rea, state of mind. Often when you are charged with a crime, a jury or a judge asks: Did you intend to do what you did? Did you know what you were doing?

Even in our civil cases when we think about the negligence standard, there is still a question about whether somebody was indifferent to what they were doing. Well, in this case, these young people had no idea what was going on. They had no participation in even coming to the United States, but they find themselves here as Americans.

□ 1915

I hope that our Nation and this Congress and the next President will be big enough, will be gracious enough, will respect their humanity, do the right thing, and make sure that they are protected under the law.

First of all, thank you for holding your town hall, which may have been the first one in this season after the election. We are going to have one in San Antonio on December 11, which is a Sunday, with State Representative Diego Bernal, who really helped organize it and spearhead it; Congressman LLOYD DOGGETT, who also represents part of San Antonio; State Senator Jose Menendez.

There are also other Members who I know are going to hold similar town halls in their cities. I will read off just a few of them because I think it is important to acknowledge that work:

PETE AGUILAR in San Bernardino, California; TONY CÁRDENAS in Los Angeles, California; RUBEN GALLEGOS in Phoenix, Arizona; RAÚL GRIJALVA in Tucson, Arizona; MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM in New Mexico; and RAUL RUIZ, who has a district in southern California. I know that there are others that are being scheduled.

I think all of this work is so important because when we talk about DACA, we are not talking about a piece of legislation that is going to take months to come through the House of Representatives and the Senate. This is something, a decision, that the new President on January 20 can make a decision to do away with it completely and to subject these kids to deportation, often to a country that they have never known, that they have no recollection of being a part of or growing up in. This really is a moral question, as you mentioned, for the country that pulls at our conscience.

Thank you for all your work.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I can't thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) enough for taking the time to be here for his leadership on this issue. Not just after this election, and not just since he has been in the House of Representatives, but really his whole life has been exemplary in his advocacy for the most vulnerable amongst us in ensuring the truth about the story of these young people who come to our country.

It is not simply a matter of sympathy—although, I sympathize with their situation—it is also a matter of our self-interest as a country. As we continue to look for ways to become a stronger and better country, so much of that lies with those who have made the very difficult choice to come here and contribute to our success and contribute to the American Dream. I am grateful to you for continuing to advocate for them and to share those stories with the rest of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), another very good friend from a State that has known its share

of amazing stories of immigration and seeing those immigrants flourish and become the best of us in this country.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman O'ROURKE for yielding and for organizing this critical Special Order.

Most importantly, thank you for your fierce advocacy for people of your district, for people of our country, for immigrants, and for DREAMers.

Let me begin by echoing your comments and that of our colleague, Mr. CASTRO's, as well. The stories that you both have shared underscore the urgency that we face in protecting these children and young adults from deportation under the next administration.

Tonight, right now, there are high school seniors across our country writing college essays, compiling recommendations, and filling out applications who are not sure if they will be allowed to stay in this country when it comes time to enroll in classes.

There are elementary and middle school students that are working diligently on their homework because, one day, they want to pursue a college education or work in their communities, but now they are not sure if that day will come.

There are young professionals working in our factories, teaching in our schools, volunteering in our neighborhoods, or even preparing to join the military that are going to sleep tonight worried that, when the calendar strikes 2017, the only life that they have ever known might be shattered.

All of these children, these young people, all 740,000 of them, they are our future. They put their trust in us, their government, in our promise to protect them if they stepped out of the shadows.

Today, that faith is frayed. It is our responsibility, all of ours, as this body, to commit to them that the only country that they know will not wash away their contributions, those that they have made, and send them to an unfamiliar land; because they believe in the American Dream just as our ancestors did and as we do today; because they are DREAMers; because they are our neighbors, our friends, our classmates, our community, and so much more; because they are countrymen.

Down this hallway in the Senate, a few of our Republican colleagues have already started on legislation to protect DACA beneficiaries. In order to lift the cloud of doubt for thousands in our country, fighting for their rights must be our priority today and every day until we succeed.

Congressman O'ROURKE, Congressman CASTRO, and my colleagues gathered here with us this evening, thank you for your work, thank you for your passion, thank you for your commitment. I know that we are on the right side of this fight when I see all of you standing here.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for his eloquence on this

and for his empathy in allowing us to try to think about what it must feel like to be working on that finals paper or that homework assignment in high school or at community college or at one of our great universities and not know if at the start of next semester you will find yourself in another country, in a place that is now strange to you, with a language that you don't speak.

When we think about this, when we think about these mass deportations, literally using the information that these young people and their families came forward with to register under the DACA program, and then using that against them after they voluntarily came forward, to find out where they live, pick them up, process them, deport them back to their country of origin, beyond the incalculable emotional human psychological toll, beyond what that would do to the conscience of this country, look at what it would cost us in financial terms. We would lose 2 to 2.6 percent of our GDP. We would lose nearly \$5 trillion over the next 10 years, and government receipts on the trillions of dollars that these DREAMers would otherwise earn would also be gone with those DREAMers—nearly \$900 billion that we would lose from the United States Treasury.

We would lose young Americans like the one who is pictured next to me, David Gamez, who is now 20 years old and who joined us Monday at our town hall in El Paso, Texas, one of these brave young El Pasoans, young Americans, who had the courage to come forward, and shared with us at that town hall that he came to this country at the age of 10. He came from Mexico City. He immediately applied himself, learned English, rose to the top of the ranks in his high school classes, took AP courses, is now a member of the STEM club at the El Paso Community College, and is pursuing a career in electrical engineering. He is an artist, he loves to draw, he loves to paint, and he wants to be an innovator. His heroes are all American heroes. His heroes are Elon Musk, Bill Gates, and Larry Ellison, those people who are contributing to our country, creating jobs, innovating, creating, growing this economy. That is what David wants to do. That is what he will do if he is able to stay in this country.

I think it is so important for us to give David the certainty and, also at the same time, not to provoke anxiety and fear that will cause him to lose this opportunity, to lose his way, and for us to lose out on all the amazing things that he can create.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), who I have the pleasure of sitting with on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and who, over the last 4 years, I have learned from because she is the most tireless champion for veterans. She is the most tireless champion for the LGBT community. She is often the most tireless champion for those who do not have a

voice in our system or whose voice is not loud enough. So it is up to Ms. TITUS to amplify that voice and become their advocate.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman O'ROURKE for yielding. You are too kind in your compliments. I give them right back to you. We have worked together on many things, including veterans and public lands, and now this very pressing issue of what we can do to protect our DREAMers.

Since the election, my office has just been deluged by phone calls from the DACA recipients, those we call DREAMers, from their friends, and from their family. They are afraid. You can just hear the fear in their voice. They are just calling to ask questions: Will I be deported? Will my friends be deported? Will my family be separated? Will I lose my house? Will I lose my job? Will I lose my scholarship? Should I apply for DACA? Should I apply to renew DACA? Or should I just keep my head down and hope that they don't notice that I am here?

It just tears your heart out. That is one of the reasons that in my district, in Las Vegas, we held a round table, not a town hall. We started with those organizations who help DREAMers. We had Catholic charities; we had the university, UNLV; we had other institutions of higher education; we had the Latin Chamber; and we had the Mexican and the Salvadoran Consulate all gathered around the table because we don't know how to answer those questions. We wanted to be sure we were all on the same page, giving people the same advice, and reassuring them that whatever happens, we will be there for them. That helps a little, but still you want to be able to say: This is what you are facing.

I know I am not the only one getting these calls. They are coming from kitchens and living rooms and restaurants and stores and families all across this country, as you have heard from some of the other speakers here tonight. For our DREAMers and their families, this fear and anxiety will continue to grow. I am afraid they are just going to return to the shadows if we don't act soon to responsibly reform our immigration system.

Now, as yet, we have heard very little from the Trump transition team about what is actually going to happen to the DREAMers once President Obama leaves office.

Will they round up people and send them back? Will they build that wall?

We don't know. But what we do know is that Mr. SESSIONS has been appointed as Attorney General, who has a very long record of opposing comprehensive immigration reform, actually railing against it; and that is not a very good sign.

After months of just disgraceful campaign rhetoric speeches that denigrate immigrants, Trump and his team now have to really deal with the gravity of the situation. I would suggest, to begin with, they should acquaint themselves

with some of the young men and women who have been able to go to work, go to school, contribute to the tax base, contribute to society and our culture, like those that Mr. O'ROURKE mentioned, because they had that protection of DACA.

Instead of demoralizing and degrading them, they should take the time to learn about people like Brenda Romero. Brenda is a young DREAMER who interned in my office this summer. She is one of 12,000 DREAMers in Nevada. She is not a rapist and she is not a drug dealer. She is a high school graduate and the first immigrant to be the student body president of a small college in my home State. She is now pursuing a law degree.

Brenda was brought to the United States from Mexico when she was just 2 years old. Like so many of the over 700,000 DREAMers, she didn't really have any choice in that decision. She has had a choice about her life, and she has made the most of it, like so, so many DREAMers, including another dreamer from Las Vegas who many of you have seen on television, an amazing national spokeswoman for this campaign for DREAMers, Astrid Silva.

□ 1930

They have contributed, and they inspire me. That is the reason I am joining the gentleman here tonight to talk about their stories, and they are the reason that I will continue to be on the front line—to fight to make this country a better place for them so they, in turn, can make it a better place for all of us.

I want you to go out and meet these people. I want you to sit down with them eye to eye. I call on all of my colleagues to do that. Hear their stories, and you will understand just how remarkable they are. They will make you feel very proud, and you will find that you have more in common with them and their families than you have apart.

We are not a country that should alienate immigrants. We are a country that is characterized by the Statue of Liberty: give me your tired, your poor, your hungry, those yearning to be free. Surely, we can't forget that kind of history and heritage that we have of welcoming immigrants with open arms. We are not a country that should be tearing families apart. As we stand here tonight on the floor of the House, I would just ask you to make that effort to get to know the DREAMers in your community. Hear their stories, and I think you will agree with me just how remarkable they are.

So I thank the gentleman for letting me speak. Count on me to continue this fight. I think, if we can't get comprehensive immigration reform done in the short term, let's at least protect those DREAMers who already have that status so that they don't have to live in fear.

Mr. O'ROURKE. I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada for sharing these personal stories of the people in her

community who inspire her. It is these stories of courage that the gentlewoman just recounted and that I have been trying to share about the young DREAMers in my community of El Paso that were the impetus for our coming together this evening and sharing with our colleagues and the people of this country the truth about a group of very special young people who are too often misunderstood, if not outright maligned; so I am grateful to the gentlewoman for her efforts to improve our understanding of this very special group of people.

When I am thinking about these courageous, young people whom I have been introducing you to tonight from the city of El Paso who happen to have come to this country, to my city, from another country at a very tender age—be it 3, be it 5, be it 7 years old—now, as they are in their teens and in their early twenties, we find them to be flourishing and inspiring us.

I want to share a story that goes back a few generations as I introduce the next Member who will speak. That is the story of Mildred Parish Tutt, who in El Paso, Texas, in 1955, after having graduated from Douglass High School—a segregated, all-Black institution in my community of El Paso, Texas—had the audacity to apply for enrollment at Texas Western College, now known as the University of Texas at El Paso, and her application was rejected solely based on her race.

Mildred and her friend Thelma White and a few other students who were denied enrollment teamed up, and, with the help of the NAACP and an attorney named Thurgood Marshall, they took this issue and their aspiration and this case to a Federal court. Thanks to the wisdom and the judgment of our Federal judge at the time, R.E. Thomason, not only was it found that Texas Western's ban on African American students was unconstitutional, but his ruling and their effort and Mildred's courage effectively desegregated the institutions of higher learning in the State of Texas for every single Texan.

As I was sharing with some of our colleagues yesterday, as I was introducing my very good friend BARBARA LEE, this took incredible personal sacrifice. I can only imagine the difficulty that Mildred faced on that day; yet it was so incredibly important for this country. That is the kind of story that we are telling today about these, again, courageous, special young people in our midst whom we want to continue to allow to flourish.

I want to, at this time, yield to the gentlewoman from California, BARBARA LEE, who has her roots deeply in the State of Texas at El Paso.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman very much.

First of all, I thank Congressman O'ROURKE for lifting up my mother, who was a phenomenal woman, who passed away last year, and who broke many glass ceilings. I want to thank the gentleman for recognizing what a

true shero she was; so I just had to tell you. I want to thank the gentleman also for his tireless advocacy on behalf of my hometown and the place of my birth, El Paso, Texas, on so many fronts but especially on behalf of immigrants.

I grew up in an immigrant community. I can tell you my mother, my grandfather, my sisters, and my brothers-in-law—everybody from El Paso—consider the gentleman our Representative, so I thank him very much. We are very proud of him.

Mr. Speaker, I attended St. Joseph's Elementary School on Waco Avenue, and we were taught that we must value the dignity of all human beings. I was taught by the Sisters of Loretto in El Paso. So now, in representing the beautiful East Bay of northern California, my values and what I learned from my mother and my grandfather and my parents in El Paso really drive me to continue our fight on behalf of our young people, on behalf of our DREAMers.

Four years ago, President Obama made history by announcing the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, DACA. This critical program provides—and this is just common-sense—humane protections for undocumented Americans, mind you, who were brought to our Nation as young children. Since the executive action, about 744,000 young people have benefited from this important program.

I am proud to say, though, that now one in three DREAMers in the United States is from my State of California. These are brilliant young people who deserve the chance to live the American Dream. DACA empowers young people and keeps families together even in the face of Republican inaction on comprehensive immigration reform.

This is an issue that is dear to my heart. As I said, I grew up in El Paso in an immigrant community; so I know no option. I mean, we have to protect our young people and keep families together. More than a quarter of the residents now in my congressional district were born outside of the United States. Tens of thousands of young people have benefited from the DACA program.

We sponsored a town meeting several weeks ago. Actually, it was sponsored by Oakland Community Organizations, which is an affiliate of PICO. It was an amazing town meeting. Everyone participated. It was multiracial. It was held in the Catholic cathedral. There are several stories I would like to share, just very quickly, that we heard that night.

One DREAMer and DACA recipient—let's call her Amy—was born in Venezuela and immigrated to the United States as a child. DACA opened doors for Amy. She received her bachelor's degree at UCLA and then went on to obtain her law degree. This is really impressive. Through her hard work, Amy became the first DACA recipient to be admitted to the California bar. I am so proud of Amy. She has taken her

skills and experiences to give back to our community. Today, she works at a nonprofit in the East Bay where she is an advocate for immigration reform and helps other young people benefit from the DACA program; but while she spends her days helping her community, she still lives in fear—in fear for her family, in fear for her friends, in fear of being deported at any moment.

I have another constituent—let's call him Gabriel—whom I met recently at the same event. Gabriel was born in Mexico and immigrated to the United States 10 years ago. Since then, he has used his voice to empower his community and advocate for immigrants. In high school, he started a local DREAMers club that advocates for the inclusion and advancement of undocumented students. He went on to attend UC Berkeley and was able to receive funds to cover most of his studies. Through DACA and State policies, he was able to afford the high cost of living in the Bay Area and receive a world-class education.

He and Amy show the incredible potential of our Nation's young people. Their determination to live the American Dream, to receive a quality education, and to help their communities was really unlocked through DACA. It is terrible to think of the dreams that would be destroyed by rolling back DACA now.

Time and time again, I hear stories like Gabriel's and Amy's—stories of families who are kept together because of DACA and of young people who are able to attend college and pursue these dreams. Now these young people are afraid. They fear that their families will be torn apart, that their parents may be deported, and that their American Dreams are truly in jeopardy.

We have always been a nation of immigrants. This is a history that we should be proud of; but, right now, we know that immigrants in my district, in El Paso, and all across our Nation are scared to death about what this next administration will bring. There are families who wake up in fear that, come January 21, their work or their school will be raided. There are DREAMers who dread being forced to leave the country—the only country that they have ever known. This is morally wrong. The nuns who taught me at St. Joseph's would be shocked if they knew what was taking place now. We are better than this. These young people deserve better from our country, and they deserve better from this Congress.

Again, I am calling on my Republican colleagues to let us vote on bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform—legislation that will reunify families, that will grow our economy, and that will provide a clear pathway to citizenship. I know the gentleman and all of our colleagues are going to continue to fight for and to pass immigration reform and the DREAM Act; but, minimally, we have to protect our Nation's DREAMers, our immigrants, and all families.

I thank the gentleman again for his leadership. I thank him for inviting me to be with him tonight. Again, my family is very proud of him, our Congressman.

Mr. O'ROURKE. I thank the gentleman from California, and I thank her for continuing to cut the profile in courage in Congress and for her fierce advocacy on the issues that matter most. She continues to stand out as an example to me, and tonight is testimony to that; so I am grateful to her for being here.

I now want to yield to yet another good friend. It is an embarrassment of riches, in the Chamber this evening, to have so many talented Members who have decided to stand up with some of the best among us. In my opinion, the gentleman from Oregon, who in the 4 years that I have been here has taught me so much and much of that by example, is perfectly suited to share his experiences, those of the community he represents, and what he wants to see going forward for this great country.

I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak this evening and for his thoughtfulness in organizing this conversation and inviting others of our colleagues to come forward.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is so important to be able to put a human face on an issue that sometimes gets lost in the rhetoric. We have had a lot of rhetoric this last year. The fears that were stoked by the campaign with harsh words about immigrants, people of different religions, people who would be at risk of deportation, to maybe having a registry, having denial based on people's religions or what their perceived religions might be has sent shock waves, but it is nothing compared to what I have experienced in the days immediately after the election.

People who were apprehensive and concerned are terrified—children unsure about whether parents will be there when they come home from school, people who are concerned about whether they will be able to have employment. It is not just people who may not have their documents in order. This touches millions of Americans who are part of extended families, who are part of families in the workplace.

I was honored to be part of a fundraising event 2 weeks ago that was hosted by Oregon's wine industry. We came together in a lavish fundraising dinner and raised hundreds of thousands of dollars for the health care for the employees in their vineyards. Now, they are not asking about their documentation. They understand that there may be some who are questionable, but they are not seeking in terms of what people's histories are.

□ 1945

They have people here who have worked with them for years who are

like family and who are connected to the community. The notion of sending these young people back, who, as you and our other colleagues have pointed out, came here as children—they didn't have any choice. What 4-year-old, 3-year-old, 2-year-old infant is making this perilous journey on their own? They were brought here. They were raised here.

Many of these young people, as you have already had testimony this evening, have had amazing records of success. They took the United States Government and its President at his word and came forward and took a little bit of a risk because they wanted to be part of the fabric of this country. They are in this situation, sadly, because of a failure of will by my Republican friends in the House.

As the gentleman knows, he was here when we had an opportunity to vote on comprehensive immigration reform that passed the Senate on a bipartisan basis. It wasn't a great bill, but it was an important step forward, on a bipartisan basis, that would have prevented some of this confusion, some of this pain, and some of this uncertainty.

If the Republican leadership had allowed it to come to the floor for a vote, they wouldn't have had to twist any arms. There would have been more than enough votes on both sides of the aisle to enact it. That failure of courage stoked part of this hateful campaign that we have all experienced and has kept these unfortunate people and their families and friends—whether they are citizens, employees, they're part of the community—under a cloud.

This is a failure of the House of Representatives that has created this situation. We should not, as a country, compound it by raising the specter of decent, hardworking, young people who are here through no act of their own, who have taken a step forward, a little risk to try and integrate into our society, who are high performing.

I could give examples tonight of a young man who is completing his dental studies at the Oregon Health & Science University, a DREAMer who dreams big about serving his community as a professional dealing with dental health. There is a young woman who is a human resource professional at the largest school district in our State, who isn't just adding her competence, but is being able to provide opportunities to deal with some of the real serious human resource questions from first-line experience. We could all do this if we tried.

Representative O'ROURKE, I deeply appreciate your bringing this forward. I think it would be a tragedy if we were to punish people who took the President at his word, who put confidence in this Congress, to unwind this unfortunate situation. But I think it is important that all of us add our voices, that we connect with the people at home who are desperate, apprehensive, and vulnerable, to be able to make sure the American public knows what is at

stake; because if we add our voices, our examples, and engage them, there is no doubt in my mind that there will be enough public pressure to prevent a tragedy of immense proportions.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and could not agree more forcefully with his words. In addition to these, again, inspiring examples of what the DREAMers mean to us as a country and what they mean to the gentleman personally, I also enjoyed hearing about how the community he represents is rallying around them and supporting them and ensuring that they know that they are not alone, despite the rhetoric, despite the changes that we might see in executive actions going forward.

I am also deeply appreciative of the gentleman's reminder that it is this institution that really has the opportunity, the responsibility, and the power to correct this. In these 4 years that I have had the pleasure of joining you here in the House, I know that both of us and dozens of our colleagues have tried mightily to do that, but, unfortunately, to no avail. That does not in any way dampen my enthusiasm to do this. In fact, these stories that we are sharing tonight only cause me to want to redouble my efforts and work with you and our colleagues to make sure that we do everything we can and, beyond that, that we are ultimately effective and successful in setting this country, when it comes to our immigration laws and it comes to the lives of these 750,000 DREAMers, in the right direction. So I thank the gentleman for being here this evening.

One thing that the gentleman from Oregon said that really struck home—and helps me to introduce a very good friend of mine from El Paso, Claudia Yoli—were his comments about family and the importance of family and how fundamental family is to our success.

So I ask those in the Chamber this evening to think about Claudia Yoli, who is pictured here, to my right, in front of the White House, perhaps in 2013 when she served as an intern in my congressional office here. She came to this country for the first time at the age of 8, from Venezuela, and has been nothing but exceptional to the community that she lives in, to the country that is now her home, and to those that she has worked with, including me and my office, and our State Senator Jose Rodriguez, for whom she works today. She showed courage in coming to our townhall on Monday evening, where she told us about all of this and then shared something that was so personally painful and tragic that it could only help me to understand truly what is at stake here.

In 2010, Claudia's mother traveled back to Venezuela. Because of Claudia's status, because she was a DREAMer and because of provisions within the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, she was not able to go back to Venezuela with her mother.

Unfortunately, last year, Claudia's mother passed away in Venezuela, and Claudia could not be there to comfort her mother in her dying days, nor could she be there for the funeral, nor could she be there with those family members who came together to grieve her mother's passing. Our inaction causes tremendous pain and suffering for those whom we have the power to help right now.

I yield at this point to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), another colleague with whom I was elected in 2012.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am Congressman BILL FOSTER, and I am proud to represent the 11th District of Illinois.

In our district, we have vibrant immigrant communities from all over the world. I have met many DREAMers, both at home in Illinois and right here in the Halls of Congress. For many of them, the United States is the only country that they have ever called home.

Our district includes the diverse cities of Aurora, Bolingbrook, Joliet, and others. In Aurora, the East Aurora High School District 131 has one of the largest Naval Junior ROTCs in the world. Many of these young ROTC students come from immigrant families, and they dream one day of serving our country in the Armed Forces. You can see it in their faces during flag ceremonies, parades, and you can see the admiration of the younger children looking up to these ROTC DREAMers. Many of them are here because their parents dreamed of a better life for their children.

The DACA program has been incredibly successful. Over half a million young people are currently enrolled in it. They are living examples of the American Dream, the idea that anyone could come here and have a fulfilling and prosperous life regardless of where you come from and where you live.

Instead of creating new opportunities for these great young people, Republicans in Congress have repeatedly voted to end the DACA program. We need to reform our outdated immigration laws and not double down on a broken system. As their Representatives, we should honor their patriotism and dedication to our country with support, not fear and degradation. It is a pretty simple proposition.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) for being here this evening, for standing up for some who, especially right now, feel that perhaps their government is not with them and perhaps these commitments that were made to them that engendered their trust, their willingness to come forward to share their personal information, their addresses, their identities, perhaps have been abandoned. Your presence here tonight, your words, I think, do much to show them that that is not the case and that there is still a chance in this country that we will do the right thing.

I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) for being here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say that, whether it is these 750,000-plus DREAMers, these young Americans who, at a very tender age, were brought to this country by their parents or relatives and in every single way, except for citizenship, are no different than my three children or anyone else that I represent in the great City of El Paso, Texas—these DREAMers are going to high school, are serving in our Armed Forces, are attending our universities, are, in many respects, the future of our communities, of our country, who have so much to gain personally and so much to give back to this country. These DREAMers must be spared from any decisions that would break the trust that was created with them, that would force them back to their countries of origin, which they no longer know as home, whose language they no longer speak, where they no longer have family with whom they can reside.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is also important, on the larger subject of how we talk about those who are in our country from another country, that we remember a few facts. For example, the border that connects us with our country and neighbor to the south, Mexico, is as safe today as it has ever been. The community that I have the honor to represent and to serve, El Paso, Texas, which is conjoined with Ciudad Juarez to form the largest binational community anywhere in the world, is the safest city in the United States. It is safe not in spite of, but precisely because of, our connection to Mexico, the Mexican immigrants, the Mexican Americans, and those who are in our community, documented or otherwise, that make El Paso such a tremendously safe, wonderful, thriving community.

We know that U.S. cities on the border with Mexico and U.S. cities with large immigrant populations are, in fact, far safer than the average U.S. city in the interior, be that in Kentucky, be that in Iowa. That is what we have to be proud of. That is what we need to share with the American public.

We also need them to know that immigrants, documented or otherwise—and including, especially, those who are undocumented—commit crimes, including violent crimes, at a far lower rate than do native-born U.S. citizens.

We need to remember that we have so much to be proud of, so much to be grateful for, so much to celebrate in the immigrants' story, especially these DREAMers who, right now, live in a period of uncertainty, fear, and anxiety. It is incumbent upon us in this Chamber to do what we must to change our laws to reflect our values and the reality in our communities and in our country. Mr. Speaker, I stand ready to work with any Member on either side of the aisle to do just that.

I want to thank my colleagues who joined me tonight to help drive home the very important point that everyone who is in our country that has registered with the government, that has come forward, that has applied successfully under the DACA program deserves to stay here and deserves our help to ensure our laws allow them to do that going forward.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, thank you to my colleague Mr. O'ROURKE for his work to highlight such an important issue.

Since November 9th, many of the immigrants in my district of Dallas-Fort Worth have been rightfully nervous about their future in the United States.

It is no secret where the President-Elect stands on immigration.

He has vowed to repeal the highly successful Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, commonly known as DACA.

This move is wrong for America and for the immigrants whose lives have been forever changed by the program.

Since 2012, over 135,000 bright young Texans have successfully applied for the program.

It has been life changing for all those who qualified.

This has been especially true for one of my constituents, Erik.

Erik is a 27-year-old DACA recipient who immigrated to the United States from Mexico with his mother when he was just two years old.

Erik was unaware of his immigration status for the majority of his life until he reached a critical milestone at the age of 16.

When he asked his mother if he could apply for his driver's license, what normally would be an exciting event turned into a difficult conversation with his mother about his immigration status.

Erik was devastated because although he called the United States home, he would be unable to move forward with his life as he planned.

Once he graduated from high school, Erik knew that attending college would be a significant challenge—one he almost didn't take on.

He shared that he wasn't even sure college was the right decision because he was unsure that he could get a job after he graduated.

Yet, he persevered and graduated in 2011—but once again was confronted with the reality that his undocumented status created additional challenges.

Although he was college educated, Erik couldn't legally work in the United States.

But with the announcement of DACA in 2012, Erik had a ray of hope.

Finally, Erik could legally work and better participate in the country he's called home since the age of two.

Since successfully receiving DACA status, Erik has worked as a Store Systems Engineer at Rent-A-Car and has advocated for other undocumented immigrants.

Unfortunately, the newly found freedom Erik enjoyed under DACA is now in jeopardy.

Now, with just weeks away until the President-Elect is sworn into office, millions of DREAMers are frightened they will be forced to return to the shadows or be targeted for deportation.

These young aspiring immigrants are already part of our communities.

They attend our schools, work alongside us, and live in our neighborhoods.

For Erik and the thousands of other DREAMers across Texas, the revocation of DACA could mean returning to countries they haven't called home since they were children.

While we work to reform our broken immigration system, we must remember that the immigrants we speak of are just like us—they have hopes, dreams, and want to live a good life.

Like Erik, I believe that we need to move forward with immigration reform.

I believe we can do so in a way that keeps families together and benefits our country as a whole at the same time.

I stand here alongside my colleagues to remind our country's DREAMers that the fight isn't over.

Our fight here in Congress has just begun.

PROTESTS OF THE DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about the rule of law, the importance of enforcement of the rule of law, the importance of a government that stands for law and order.

I ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, as I begin my comments tonight by reading a resolution of support, a resolution that illustrates the position of a very important organization in my State of North Dakota, the North Dakota Veterans Coordinating Council.

□ 2000

It reads like this:

Whereas: The protests against the Dakota Access Pipeline have been going on for over 100 days in North Dakota.

Whereas: The protests have been conducted on public and private land without proper permission.

Whereas: The protests have not remained peaceful. In fact, the protesters have caused millions of dollars in damage. They have destroyed public and privately owned property, vehicles, and equipment to include heavy equipment and trucks owned by private contractors, at least two government trucks, cut privately owned fences, and slaughtered farm animals owned by private farms. Protesters have assaulted and thrown Molotov cocktails and hard objects at North Dakota law enforcement officers and military personnel who are sworn to keep the peace and protect North Dakota's citizens.

Whereas: Protesters have desecrated North Dakota State and Federal property, to include the North Dakota State Capitol and, yes, the North Dakota pillar of the World War II Monument right here in Washington, D.C., located at The National Mall.

Whereas: The protesters of the Dakota Access Pipeline in and around Standing Rock have desecrated the American flag by flying it upside down, sewing emblems over the flag, and displaying emblems and non-U.S. flags in a dominant manner to the U.S. flag in violation of North Dakota Century Code.

Whereas: 95 percent of the protesters are not North Dakota citizens or Native Americans. Many are professional paid protesters

unaware of the true understanding of the issues at hand.

Whereas: As former military members, we have all taken an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States against foreign and domestic enemies, the American flag, and our freedom. As veterans, we continue to support our military, law enforcement, and all of our constitutional rights we have fought for.

Whereas: As veterans of the U.S. military, we have fought for and maintained the rights of our citizens to peacefully protest. The protests in Standing Rock have not been peaceful and, therefore, violate the rights of those living peacefully around the protest site and threaten the sanctity and sustainability of our basic freedom of peaceful protests by crossing the line into unlawful activities.

Whereas: Individual veterans and veteran groups from outside of the State of North Dakota have reached out to North Dakota veterans and veterans service organizations for support in their plan to recruit veterans to assemble in North Dakota in support of the Standing Rock protest against the Dakota Access Pipeline.

Whereas: Veterans standing in a nonpeaceful protest against the Dakota Access Pipeline, will also be standing against North Dakota law enforcement, military, private and government entities, reflects poorly upon themselves, our veterans organizations, veterans as a whole, the State of North Dakota, and our country.

Therefore: Let it be the position of the North Dakota Veterans Coordinating Council made up of the North Dakota AMVETS, American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Vietnam Veterans of America adamantly oppose and condemn any veteran organization or persons representing themselves as U.S. military veterans who associate or involve themselves with the illegal activities which have occurred or take part in any unlawful or unbecoming conduct or assembly in protest to the Dakota Access Pipeline in North Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, I could never say it better than the men and women who have fought and who have been willing to die for our liberties. They have said it perfectly in this position in support of a legally permitted pipeline and in support of our law enforcement officers who have exercised tremendous restraint against violence thrown at them. I, for one, am tired, as are the vast majority of North Dakotans, of people from outside of our State with a political agenda who have co-opted the reasonable, peaceful protests that once began what has become a full-fledged riot.

Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 months, thousands of rioters disguising themselves as prayerful people, peaceful protesters, have illegally camped on Federal land owned or at least managed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, owned by the taxpayers of this country. They have illegally camped on the shores of the Missouri River.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, if you and I decided to go for a walk on that same land and picked up a rock and threw it in the river, we would be fined by this government. But, oh, no, not antifossil fuel rioters. No, they are enabled; no, they are encouraged by our Federal Government, at least this current Administration.

Celebrities, bad actors; celebrities, political activists; and anti-oil extremists are blocking this pipeline's progress, and they are doing so based not on good information, not on the law, but rather on a leftwing political agenda. Oh, by the way, these celebrities and these rioters fly in on jet airplanes that are fueled by jet fuel that is refined from oil, in many cases Bakken oil; but let's ignore the irony and the hypocrisy for the moment.

North Dakotans like these veterans that I just read about have respected the rights of peaceful protesters, but this has gone way beyond that. It has become rioting, plain and simple. In fact, I think it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that two Federal courts right here in the District of Columbia have upheld the legality of this pipeline. First, a D.C. Circuit district judge appointed by President Obama, I might add, denied a request for an injunction to stop this pipeline based on the fact that not only has the company and the Corps of Engineers and the North Dakota Public Service Commission met every letter of the law, but exceeded it, including, according to this judge's own opinion, exceeding the requirements for consultation with the sovereign tribes. The project developer and the Army Corps tried desperately to engage the Standing Rock Sioux tribe dozens of times, only to be rejected for more than 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, all that remains for the pipeline to be finished is an easement to begin the process and to finish the process of connecting this pipeline under the Missouri River in North Dakota, an easement that has been prepared and finished for months. Of course, the Obama administration rescinded a permit that had already been issued, a 408 permit to allow the pipeline to be built under this river. The same administration, by the way, who has gone to court to defend it. It is ironic, to say the least. It is chaos, to say the best.

At the center of this issue is an administration that refuses—not just refuses to follow the rule of law, but enables and encourages the breaking of the law, beginning with the fact that thousands of illegal protesters are allowed to camp, to trespass on federally owned land.

Now, if you allow somebody to illegally assemble, why would they not think that they should be allowed to burn property? Why would they not think they should be allowed to trespass on private land? Why would they think they shouldn't be allowed to throw Molotov cocktails at police officers trying to protect innocent citizens? Why would they not think they could follow a police officer home and harass his family until they had to move out of their home, or follow a National Guard member to their apartment and then harass them at their apartment and force their family to leave, to spit on them? Why would they think they shouldn't be allowed to do

that if the President of the United States says go ahead and trespass?

Never mind that this is a legally permitted pipeline. Let's just ignore that. Let's withdraw the permit that we have already issued, that we are defending in court. Why wouldn't they think that?

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, to virtue in this country?

When I see these protesters, rioters, criminals, thugs—yes, thugs; it is not a racial comment; it is just what you call people who are thugs—I look at them and I think, who is their mother? Where were they raised? How were they raised?

What has happened in this country when we stand here in this Chamber, in this assembly, in this town, and we hear some people, politicians, supposed leaders, talk about law enforcement as though they are the problem? What has happened that people have become confused about the difference between breaking the law and enforcing the law?

It is hard for North Dakotans to see that because we are not confused by that. We were raised by parents who told us what was right and what was wrong, who taught us to respect the legal system, to respect law enforcement officers. We have really respectable police officers in North Dakota, and we do throughout this country, because we have seen them come from multiple States. The National Sheriffs' Association has sent many officers. Other States and city police departments and counties have sent law enforcement officers to give some assistance to our overworked, overtaxed law enforcement officers right in North Dakota. We are tired of it.

Stay home, Jane Fonda; don't come back and deliver food, pretend that somehow you care and take off again in your private jet; unless you want to try to fly that jet on solar panels, then come on, we will take you.

You can't encourage illegal behavior and then wonder why there is violence, Mr. Speaker; and that is what our President has done.

Let's give a little background on this. I know a little bit about siting pipelines. I was a regulator for nearly 10 years. I have sited several of them. This 1,172-mile Dakota Access Pipeline will deliver as many as 570,000 barrels of Bakken crude oil every day to Patoka, Illinois, and then to other markets beyond. This is 570,000 barrels of oil that is currently being produced every single day. It is being transported now. It will always find its way to market. It is just that it is being transported by trains and trucks. Oh, those aren't as safe or as efficient or even as environmentally friendly ways to move oil as a safe pipeline is, especially one that is going to be buried 100 feet below the bottom of the river, to make sure that the water is safe.

From the outset of this process, the Standing Rock Sioux leaders have refused to sit down and meet with either

the Corps of Engineers or the pipeline developer. However, 55 other tribes have. The Corps consulted with 55 Native American tribes at least 389 times, after which they proposed 140 variations of the current route to avoid culturally sensitive areas in North Dakota alone.

That is right, Mr. Speaker, you are not going to read about that in the New York Times or the Washington Post. You are never going to hear about it on NBC or ABC or CBS. You may not even hear about it in North Dakota because, frankly, even our media are afraid of the ramifications of violent rioters who are willing to commit violent acts if you cross them. Yes, even my home address has been posted on their Web sites and on their Facebook pages so that they know where my family and I live. These are the prayerful, peaceful protesters you hear so much about on the NBC News.

This project route was examined, reviewed, studied, and ultimately supported by the North Dakota Public Service Commission, the State Historic Preservation Office, assorted tribal consultants from around the country, and multiple professional independent archaeologists. This is a thoroughly vetted pipeline, which is why it has over 200 Federal permits, all of which have been delivered and have been built, except for this one, which was rescinded to make a political statement.

They say that they object to the pipeline being close to the water intake of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation. However, it shouldn't be of any concern. As I said, this is going to go between 90 and 115 feet below the floor of the river. It is double-lined pipe. It has got control valves at both ends and sensors at both ends. It is the safest pipeline in the world.

By the way, the intake for Standing Rock's drinking water, the new one, which will be in service before the end of this year, is 70 miles away. There is a railroad track that carries hundreds of thousands of barrels every day over the top of the Missouri, as close as that.

By the way, the other thing you often hear is that this was not the original route, that there were other preferred routes, but because they crossed at places that affected a different kind of people than the Standing Rock Sioux tribe, that this was somehow discriminatory.

Let me set that record straight as well. I know, as I said, a fair bit about pipelines. I have read the permit. I have read the application. I have read the judge's opinions. It was always planned for this location for a very good reason, Mr. Speaker. By the way, there are at least 10 to 12 other petroleum pipelines north of this same location. This is just going to be the latest and greatest of them. The main reason this route was chosen was because it was the least intrusive on the environment, on waterways, on private property, and on cultural resources.

□ 2015

The other locations that were under consideration that were not chosen crossed many more bodies of water and were much closer to many wells and cultural resources and very important historical resources. It was 48 extra miles of previously undisturbed field areas. This is and was the best route because it is an existing corridor. In this same corridor, there is already a natural gas pipeline. There is already a large electric transmission line. That is why it was chosen.

Let me talk a little bit about the impact this is having on my State. We had the recent vandalism of the graves in Bismark. That is right. They vandalized graves in a Bismark cemetery. Of course, the unconscionable graffiti markings on the North Dakota World War II pillar that the veterans wrote about earlier are examples of how these peaceful protestors' actions don't match their claims.

The responsibility of protecting property and residents has fallen on the shoulders of the State of North Dakota because, guess what, when we asked the Obama administration for law enforcement help, for reimbursement, at least, for our State and for our counties for a situation that they created by their refusal to obey the law themselves, they sent some PR people from the Department of Justice. They sent people to watch our cops to make sure they don't do something wrong. See, again, they are confused about the difference between breaking the law and enforcing the law. We are not confused about that in North Dakota.

Attempts to get reimbursement or to get U.S. Federal help have fallen on deaf ears. So far, North Dakota has had to borrow \$17 million to cover law enforcement costs. I will tell you this—and we have heard in the Chamber a lot of bad-mouthing of the incoming administration—I can't wait. I can't wait to go to Attorney General JEFF SESSIONS and explain the situation to him and ask him for assistance. I am very encouraged by President-elect Trump's favorable comments about the Dakota Access Pipeline earlier today.

These protesters, these demonstrators, these rioters have brought protests into the communities of Bismark and Mandan. They blocked roads and traffic, forcing lock-downs at the State capital and Federal buildings. They have forced people to leave their homes. They forced daycare centers to close. This daycare was forced into lockdown twice. Can you imagine explaining to children, who don't know anything about a pipeline and they don't care—and they shouldn't have to—why they are in a lockdown, why they have to be careful. Some out-of-State thugs are circling the block, harassing the owners.

Many of our residents are fearful for the safety of their neighborhoods and volunteers are hesitant even to deliver Meals on Wheels. We have had people call us and say they can't deliver Meals

on Wheels because people won't even answer their doors because they have seen these rioters walking around their property.

Law enforcement and their families have been stopped and rioters have repeatedly tried to intimidate them. On Thanksgiving Day, 300 protesters blocked traffic in Mandan, North Dakota, carrying a large dead pig on a stick while at least as many protesters, again, trespassed and built a bridge to reach a hilltop on private property.

Law enforcement has shown tremendous constraint, giving verbal warnings that if they stop making the bridge, there would not be any arrests. It was ignored. The bridge was built. Rioters crossed, dismantled the bridge, and law enforcement held the line for hours against tremendous numbers—they were well outnumbered—without a single arrest.

The protesters are the clear agitators and the criminals here, not the police officers. There would be no law enforcement presence if these protests were truly peaceful.

For example, most media have demonized their law enforcement for use of water as a less than lethal tool during a protest in cold temperatures. They used it to hold back protesters only after they used the water to put out prairie fires that were started by the protesters. And the protestors got wet from a water cannon. By the way, that is a made-up term by the national media to make it sound like some sort of violent act by our police department. It was a water hose brought there to put out fires. And when they used that to push back hundreds of protesters when there were only dozens of police officers, now they are blamed for being the agitators.

As you can tell, I am frustrated, Mr. Speaker. I am frustrated not just by the actions of these thugs, because we have come to expect that from certain people in this country, unfortunately. I am frustrated by this administration's refusal to obey the law, to enforce the law, to support the law, but instead enable and actually encourage the breaking of the law. That is not what we elect the President for. I am so grateful we have a law-and-order President coming into office shortly.

They have been forced to arrest more than 400 people, most of them from out of State. They get bailed out rather quickly. Somehow they have a source of lots of money readily available to bail people out and cover their expenses. They have chained themselves to equipment to prevent work from being done.

Here is an interesting fact. When it was much warmer in North Dakota than it is today, they would chain themselves to the equipment. And then, after hours of being there, they would get thirsty. And police officers, rather than just letting them stay there, actually helped provide them water and held the water so that the protesters, the illegal rioters, could get

a drink of water. That is the quality of our law enforcement officers.

They burned tires and fields, as I said earlier. They damaged cars and bridges. They harassed residents and have torn down fences. They killed and slaughtered neighbors' cattle and bison and horses. There was at least one report where gunshots were fired at the police.

By the way, this protest is not about climate. We hear about that. By the way, it shouldn't have anything to do with climate. The oil is being produced. Now the issue is: How do you transport it? Do you transport it in the most environmentally and economical and efficient way in a pipeline? Or, do you transport it in some less safe, less efficient, less environmentally friendly way?

The simple fact is, our Nation will continue to produce and consume oil, and pipelines are the best way to move that oil. Legally permitting infrastructure projects have to be allowed to proceed without the threat of improper governmental meddling and activity.

By the way, what of shovel-ready jobs, Mr. Speaker? What of that? What of building the infrastructure of this country with private sector money? What a great thing. But for the Bakken and other shale oil plays in this country in the last 8 years, we still would be in a recession. Most of the jobs that have been created in the last 8 years in this country have been created in the energy sector.

It is not about water protection, as I said. There is a brand new intake system being built. It will be operational 73 miles from this pipeline. That is not the issue. That is just an excuse. By the way, that new intake is about 1.6 miles downstream of a railroad track, a railroad bridge that will carry crude oil, as well.

The pipeline is not going to come in contact with the water. It employs the latest and greatest in advanced technology. As I said, a dozen or more oil and gas and refined product pipelines already cross the Missouri River upstream from the tribe's drinking water intake, and this pipeline is crossing at a point where there is existing infrastructure. It is an infrastructure corridor.

Mr. Speaker, the rule of law matters. I am so grateful for our law enforcement officers, as I said, not just in Morton County, not just around Bismark, Mandan, and not just in North Dakota, but from around the country who have come to the assistance of our State. But, Mr. Speaker, if we think we are going to rebuild the infrastructure of this country, and every time we build a railroad track or a highway or a bridge or a pipeline or a transmission line or wind farm or factory, we are going to have to put up with this, what kind of investment is going to take place in this country?

As I said, we are not confused in North Dakota about the difference between breaking the law and enforcing

the law. The vast majority of North Dakotans—and when I say vast, well into 90 percent—support law enforcement. We are grateful for what they do. We are sorry that you are going through this.

I will fight with everything I have and use every ounce of influence I have over the next administration and with my colleagues in this Chamber to provide the resources to make sure that you get a day off, to make sure that our State gets reimbursed, and that your families are compensated for what you have gone through.

I thank law enforcement officers for taking and making the tremendous sacrifice they make to protect legal commerce, peaceful citizens, and yes, ironically, Mr. Speaker, I thank the law enforcement officers for protecting the right to express ourselves in a peaceful manner.

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

EVENTS IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to be recognized to address the floor of the United States House of Representatives. It was quite interesting to listen to the gentleman from North Dakota and the stress that they have up there; in particular, with regard to the pipeline being built through there.

I would just want to reinforce the statements made by the gentleman from North Dakota and point out that the permits are there, the process is there. We have tens of thousands of miles of pipelines in the United States of America, and we have very, very few problems with leaks or other circumstances that would cause one to think that there is a safer way to transport oil. There is not. The safest way is with the pipeline.

I am one who has actually started out in the construction business building pipelines. We have been in the construction business for 42 years. We dig in the ground, and we are doing underground utility work every day, except for Sundays, and we go deep sometimes. We go into hydraulic soil from time to time. Water tables are above where we are working. We do well points. We are working with the flow of water in the soil and underground, and we have got as good a look at this as anybody I know.

I would point out to those that are detractors that say: well, we can pollute the underground aquifer if we have a pipeline that we build and if that pipeline should leak. And I would point out something that they ought to know if they ever saw a movie of a shipwreck: oil floats on water. Therefore, it cannot penetrate down into the aquifer. You are not pumping off of the top-

skimmed surface of the aquifer. You are pumping down below. And if you should get a leak, which is extraordinarily rare, the oil pools and floats on the top and can be pumped off.

There is no safer way to transfer petroleum products and no more efficient way. It is by far the best way, which is why we have tens of thousands of pipelines all over this country moving all kinds of product, including crude oil, but also anhydrous ammonia and a number of other products across the country.

I have built the pipelines. I have been down in the trench. I have been tossed into the air and slammed to the ground and climbed down the machine. The wind, the dust, the noise, the heat, the cold, has all been around me. What I don't understand is why anybody would take people seriously that think that oil doesn't float on water, or that there is a better way to transport oil, or that somehow if they just get organized and people fund them, we are going to pay attention to them as if they were logical. They are not.

So that concludes my statement on the oil pipeline. I am hopeful, though, that in the upcoming Trump administration the future Secretary of State signs that permit that opens up that they need one section of pipe to go across the 49th parallel, Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate the Keystone XL pipeline. We can build that pipeline down to the Canadian border from the north, and we can build the pipeline up to the Canadian border from the south. But what has always been short on the Obama administration is a Hillary Clinton or a John Kerry signature on the document that says: we have an agreement with Canada to connect these pipelines together at our border. That is one section of pipe that would need to go in there.

I believe that happens under the Trump administration. And we should set aside these ridiculous arguments earlier rather than later. But America looks ridiculous in the world if we are going to argue against that very logic that, if petroleum needs to move and we are going to use it to move product around America and heat our homes and generate electricity and all the things that we do, then we need to do it as effectively and efficiently as possible or we will become noncompetitive for the rest of the country.

□ 2030

So, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize the points made by the gentleman from North Dakota, and I urge that the Corps of Engineers accelerate the operation up there, and they can commence to finish their work that goes across what is the reservoir and river, the Missouri River, get that connected and get it done. This demonstration isn't going to be over till you get done, so bore on through would be my advice.

THE DEATH OF FIDEL CASTRO

Mr. KING of Iowa. I made myself a promise yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when

I stopped in to ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN's office to congratulate her; and I would do that with many of the people who are related to, from, or descended from folks who had to leave Cuba, especially those who are there today who weren't able to leave Cuba.

We have been looking for the biological solution, which would be Castro being transferred into the next life. The very definition of the biological solution in the vernacular around this town was the eventual death of Fidel Castro.

Well, it happened, finally happened, Mr. Speaker, and so I had a celebratory cup of Cuban coffee in the office of ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. And now I would make this call, that it is time for the Cuban people and it is time for the incoming Trump administration to put together what amounts to the need for a regime change on the island of Cuba for the 11 million people that are free-spirited, hardworking, happy people, given all the circumstances that they have to fight against in the poorest country in all of the Western Hemisphere as far as their spirit is concerned.

I would pass the message along. There is a wonderful, wonderful nun in my district named Sister Marie. She served under Mother Teresa for 27 years. She served in Cuba for a long, long time, but she has been to all the—well, maybe not all, but many of the worst places in the world to serve the Lord and to help people.

She used to sneak into Cuba with seeds sewn in her clothing, into the seams of her clothing, so that she could plant a garden, and that garden then could grow and prosper and help feed the Cuban people that were living off of their monthly supply of the ration of rice, beans, and sugar.

She told me that, of all the places she has been, Cuba is the poorest place—\$20 a month for income, but the poorest place because of their spirit. The spirit of their Christian faith has been so suppressed by Castro, who has closed so many of the churches, the cathedrals. I walked into a cathedral down in Cuba, and you could see that where the pews were, that there was dust there and there weren't tracks by the pews.

But the line down through the center aisle was all polished from people walking down through the center aisle. And when you look at that, you realize the reason that there is dust out in the pews and there is not a path of people's feet moving back and forth down through the seats and the pews of this cathedral in Cuba is because that church does not function any longer as a church; it is functioning as a museum.

Castro shut down many, many of the religious institutions throughout Cuba and did his best to suppress Christian faith on that island. Occasionally, a little chapel pops up here and there, and you can see, if you are looking closely, you will see a little bit of it.

But he has been an aggressive opponent to our Christian faith, which is the foundation of the faith in Cuba.

So I am not sorry to see the end of the life of Fidel Castro. And I have made a pact with some of my Cuban friends that one day we will return to Cuba and we will swim ashore at the Bay of Pigs. And that would be the ultimate symbolic act that, when the day comes, that it is possible for, let's say, Cuban exiles to come towards the shore.

I will say, I would want to dive out of that boat and swim ashore and wade out onto a free Cuba. That is our pact. That is our mission. I am going to do my best to stay in shape to be able to accomplish that mission.

Here are some things that I saw in my trip down to Cuba, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is important that the body here pay attention to some of this.

I hear a lot of stories about how good the health care system is, about how good the educational system is. Well, we went to visit some of the educational system, Mr. Speaker, and one of them was a country school. They had, oh, I don't know, 15 or 18 kids sitting at desks in this little shack out in the country with the teacher up front looking like this was a country school from 150 years ago in my home State of Iowa.

There, when we walked in, of course, everything stopped and the kids all paid attention. They didn't get to see Americans very often. I suppose we look a little bit different, on balance, than they do and their parents do.

But we had a pretty good handful of pencils there, and that handful of pencils was swept up immediately. They couldn't wait to get their hands on pencils so that they could write. That is one of the examples of the shortage of supplies that are there.

The educational system, also, we took a ride up to the top of the mountains about 70 kilometers from Santa Clara in Cuba. There is an extension college up there that teaches agriculture. This was a ride up there that took, oh, at least 90 minutes to get up the mountain. We were sitting in the back of a Russian deuce and a half that gave us a ride up the mountain.

When we got there to this little campus built into the mountains, we had the equivalent of—we had about 40 people on this tour altogether. And as we were standing there, they brought out—the Cuban minders brought out the spokesmen for the university, and they stood there in their gray smocks, and the Cuban minders began transferring our questions to them.

So I was asking questions of the faculty at the extension college in the mountains there, and as I would ask the question, then the Cuban minder would translate the question from English into Spanish and ask in Spanish a question of the representatives of the university. They would hear the question. They would answer in Span-

ish. The Cuban minder would interpret it back into English, and he would tell us what he supposedly said.

Well, I am trying to learn the things I came there to learn, and the interpreter standing next to me, he was on the tour and he was not designed to be the interpreter, but he was the best interpreter I have ever had. His name was Ed Sabatini, and his parents owned real estate in Cuba that had been nationalized by Castro, taken away from them, and they had escaped from the island and lived in Miami.

But Ed Sabatini, the son of the refugees that had gotten out of Cuba, he said to me, as I am listening to the responses to the questions that I think are being asked, he said: You realize, don't you, that these Castro minders are not asking the questions that you are asking, and when they get the answers back, they are not giving back to you the answers that were given to them by the faculty here at this university. And I said: No, I didn't realize that. Of course, I didn't understand enough Spanish to realize that.

So he began to interpret this for me, and he was interpreting not only what was said, but he was interpreting what wasn't said, what body language was there, and filling me in on the things that he was soaking up in that encounter.

So after a little while, we realized it doesn't pay for us to stand here and talk to these people because we are not going to get the truth out of them anyway. They are just putting us through this exercise. And so we stepped away from the group and went down and spoke to some students who were sitting on the curb.

I had already asked the faculty: Do you have Internet services up here on the mountain? And the faculty had answered back, or at least through the minder: Yes, we have Internet services. So we began to talk to the students, and we got straighter answers.

Well, they did have Internet service. They had a computer class going on right then up in a building adjacent to where we were. And so I asked them: So, if you want to access the Internet, how do you get to that Internet? Tell me how that works.

Their answer was: Well, if we have research or a question that we want to get resolved, we write that question down on a piece of paper, and then we hand that to our instructor. Our instructor decides whether to approve our request or not.

If he approves it, then that goes into a packet that goes down the mountain, in a Russian deuce and a half, 70 kilometers to Santa Clara, where the Internet connection is. It is run by Castro's people. Then they look at the request. They type that request out onto the Internet if they are approved that the question can be allowed to be asked and answered, and then the question goes out on the Internet. They download the response that they are looking for. If they approve it, they

will take that response down and then redact the things they don't want the student to know, but print the document, put that document back on a Russian deuce and a half, and it goes 70 kilometers back up the mountain. It takes days or even weeks to get an answer from the Internet.

I asked them: Tell me about your Internet service. Their answer was: Oh, yes, we have Internet service here, good access to Internet service. That is what it is. Give a piece of paper a ride down a mountain on a Russian deuce and a half 70 kilometers, going through the minders and through the censors and out to the Internet, back again, redacted, back on the deuce and a half, back up the mountain.

Now, how long would it take you to research anything on the Internet if you have to process things through that means?

It was amazing to me that anyone could even seriously suggest such a thing, that it was Internet access, when it had to take two rides in a Russian deuce and a half and go through a censor and a couple of minders. That is what we saw down there at that university.

So I said: I want to go look at this computer class that is going on. As I headed up that way, the leader of our tour group was gathering people together, and I said: I am going to go look at this computer class up here.

He said: We are going to leave. That meant we were supposed to jump in these deuce and a halves and take our ride back down the mountain.

I said: I am going to go up and see the computers.

He said: Well, we are going to leave you here.

I said: Then I will see you in Havana. So I thought they were bluffing, and they were, but Ed Sabatini and I went into that classroom, kind of down in the basement of a school building there, and there sat about 12 computers, all old 386s or maybe even earlier, and they had two or three male students all sitting in front of each computer. And there on the screen was the five points of why capitalism is bad and Marxism is good. They were teaching the lesson of Marxist ideology right there on the screens of those old computers while these students sat there sharing a screen to look at.

When we walked in, it kind of took over the room. And once they found out that we were from America, the students had questions they wanted to ask, and they began to ask the questions. They were interpreted through Ed Sabatini, and then to me, and I answered them. After awhile, it became so rapid-fire that Ed just answered the questions and he told me what happened as we walked out of there.

But they were asking questions like—and this was agriculture. I said extension. So they were asking questions like, let's see: Who sets the price on the markets for, say, grain? And they are probably thinking rice and

sugar, maybe beans, and I am thinking corn and soybeans. Who sets the price?

And we say: The market sets the price.

Well, what is the market?

Well, it is supply and demand. Buyers come in and they make an offer, and if they can buy what they want at that price, then that is the price. If they are getting more than they want, they lower the price. If they are getting less than they want, they raise the price.

Pretty big idea. You could see them try to figure out what that meant.

Then they said: How many times does the price—when does the price change? They were thinking that there still was some government that set our commodity prices, our grain prices, maybe once a month or twice a year or whatever they might do.

I said to them: That price can change, actually, several times a minute. It is kind of a living, moving market because it reacts to the bids that are out there.

Hard to think of what that means.

Who sets—they wanted to know what are our land values, and I told them.

Who set the values on land?

Well, the buyers and the sellers set the value on land. They just didn't have a concept of that.

And then it would be: Why would anyone sell land if they owned land?

Well, there is a concept of real estate ownership that doesn't exist in any significant way in a Marxist economy that controls and owns everything.

So we went through that. It was a fascinating time for them, and it was fascinating for me to see how they reacted, the inquisitiveness of those young students that had an opportunity to hear what it is like in America.

And you heard from them: I want to go to America. I would say everyone in that room wanted to go to America. That is the sense of not only the deprivation that is there because they are on rations of rice and beans and sugar, but deprived, also, of ideas, the opportunity to have access to information, to exchange ideas. That has been crushed by Castro.

So the potential of the people in Cuba, which I think is terrific, has been so badly damaged by the oppressing oppression of Castro, who threw thousands of his political enemies into prison.

□ 2045

He tortured them, he beat them, and he executed many, many of them.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, the vision, the images that I saw on television back in 1959, 1960, and beyond when Castro and Che Guevara took over Cuba and they executed the political enemies. They took them up against a wall. Many of them were wearing white slacks and white Cuban shirts that hang outside their belt, and they were put up to the wall, blindfolded. They stood there with their hands tied, and they were shot. That was back when

television showed the reality of what was taking place. We hadn't gotten so sensitive that when there was murder that was picked up on cameras, it went on television without being blurred out as if somehow we are too sensitive to see things like that. It was an awful sight.

I recall a man who was about to be executed, one of Castro's enemies, and he insisted that he not be blindfolded, he insisted that he not be tied, and he insisted that he give the order for them to fire. So, Mr. Speaker, he stood in front of that execution wall in his white Cuban shirt, his white slacks, and his sandals. He raised his hand with no blindfold on him. He looked at that firing squad, he raised his hand, and in a moment of, I will say, just an amazing display of courage and nerve dropped his hand, and that firing squad fired and executed that probably very innocent Cuban there in front of that wall. He became one of thousands who were put into their graves because they were political opponents of the Marxist, the Communist, the dictator, the tyrant that had turned Cuba into a prison island; and it has been a prison island ever since 1959.

Finally, the biological solution has kicked in, and Fidel Castro is no more. There is one more to go, and that is Raul. The Cuban people need to know that when they go to their grave, their grip on the island of Cuba is letting go. It has got to let go, and the free spirit that exists within the hearts of the Cuban people needs to be released. They need to be freed up on that island so they can control their own destiny, they can live their own lives, they can become prosperous by their brains and the sweat of their own brow and have the opportunities that we have here in this country.

This new administration needs to be about regime change in Cuba. The Western Hemisphere has been terrorized by the policies of Fidel Castro and by his support for the Marxists throughout a number of countries in Central and South America. That includes Nicaragua, and it includes Venezuela with Hugo Chavez and now his successor. It includes a number of other countries. Castro has engaged in trouble in Grenada and also over into Africa. He has fomented that kind of terror and sent his army out there for hire to take freedom away from other people. If we had been absent his influence in this hemisphere, chances are South America itself would be much more free than it is today. That is Castro.

I recall visiting the Hotel Nacional. In there, when you walk inside, that was a place where the rich and famous from America used to play down in Cuba at the Hotel Nacional in Havana. It looks out across the sea, and there is a gun emplacement there, a cannon that sits down in a bunker that was used to defend the shores of Cuba back during the Spanish-American War—they say the Spanish-Cuban-American

War—in 1898. There in that hotel, you will see pictures of the celebrities of the time: Marilyn Monroe, Stan Musial, Rocky Marciano. When you walk through, you see the people that I will say lived in black-and-white fame in America. Their pictures are on the wall in the Hotel Nacional. Also, there in the parking lot was the 1959 Jaguar station wagon that was the vehicle of the previous dictator, Batista's, wife, who had that green 1959 Jaguar station wagon.

But things have stopped. They are frozen in time. The most typical taxicab in Havana was a 1954 Chevy, and it had a 3-cylinder Russian diesel engine under the hood. If you look around the island, you would see Russian tractors that were parked, and they had been stripped for parts. I didn't see any of them out there running. It is the only place in civilization that I know that once went from animal husbandry agriculture where they used beasts of burden to till the fields to Russian tractors when the Russians were subsidizing the Cubans, and then when the Soviet Union imploded, Mr. Speaker; and that ended Christmas Day 1991, when the Soviet Union went under and was no more. Over a period of time their subsidy for the island of Cuba dried up.

They were subsidizing Cubans this way. Cubans then were producing sugar. The open market on sugar was 6 cents a pound. The Russians were sending them oil for sugar, making a trade. The sugar that was going to Russia was costing the Russians 51 cents worth of oil. So you have a more than eight times multiplier effect sugar for oil, and that profit that was in there was what was propping up the failed, failed, failed economy of Cuba.

The Soviet Union imploded. That subsidy ended, and those Russian tractors broke down and finally died. So you end up with brahma oxen that are out there doing the tillage in the field. They would tie them on a piece of rope, and they would have what I called a pivot grazing system rather than a pivot irrigation system. I happened to plow behind a team of brahma oxen out there just kind of for sport. He was out in the field working. I asked him: Can I take a round? So I got to do that and got a picture of that, Mr. Speaker. That island had regressed so much that the tractors were parked and the animals had been put back to work.

Hugo Chavez decided he would prop up the Cuban island with the wealth of his oil. Of course, when Chavez himself went to his Maker, thankfully, and the prosperity that Venezuela enjoyed collapsed around the failed ideology of a Marxist-controlled economy, that then shut down the subsidy for Cuba.

Who should come along to save the day?

Barack Obama, who decided he is going to open up trade with Cuba, establish an embassy there, and let American dollars come down into Cuba so the island could become prosperous again.

We needed to let the Marxist regime finally be starved out. That was the purpose of the sanctions against Cuba, and that is why it has never been wise to open up free trade with Cuba. Now it is wise for this incoming Trump administration to promote regime change in Cuba. Raul can't last much longer. Freedom must come to the Cuban people, and I want to swim ashore at the Bay of Pigs and walk out on a free Cuba. I have done that at GTMO, but I want to do that at the Bay of Pigs, Mr. Speaker.

Another way that Cuba was propped up would be any foreign currency that came in—tourists could come into Cuba, and they would come into Cuba especially from Europe. They would go to the beaches at Varadero and other places, and so they spent their euros there. Americans would sneak into Cuba by going through the Bahamas and get their passport punched out there and take a separate flight and fly into Cuba. They might also come in through the south or come in through Mexico, but American dollars came down.

Now, here is the rule: we think we are helping Cubans by doing business with Cuba with American dollars. Here is how it was when I was there—and I don't think it is any different today—the exchange rate of the Cuban peso to the dollar was 21 pesos to the dollar. Cubans could earn American dollars, they could hold American dollars, but they can't spend American dollars unless they go to a Cuban bank where they have to take their American dollar, lay that down on the counter and get an exchange for Cuban currency. But the Cuban currency doesn't give them 21 pesos, which is the exchange rate for their American dollar. It gives them one peso for the American dollar, and 20 pesos go into Castro's bank account to prop up Cuba.

That is how he is raking the vigorish out of those transactions that are there. Or they could go into a Dollar Store where their dollar would only get them a peso. That is how that money went back into the hands of Castro. He is raking up the foreign currency and using that to prop up the military, keep his prisons open, and suppress and repress the Cuban people.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a place in history here where I am glad to see that the Trump administration understands what needs to happen in Cuba. I am hopeful the Cuban people have enough of that spirit left in them to understand what they need to do. Mourn for Fidel is not what they need to do, but replace him with a leader of, by, and for the Cuban people, and a constitution that protects the individual interest and rights of the Cuban people is what needs to happen.

I fully support the effort of the free-minded and free-spirited Cuban people to one day also be free, all 11 million of them. Mr. Speaker, I will do my best to stay in shape so I can swim ashore and wade out onto a free Cuba.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 5 p.m. and December 2 on account of medical appointment.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2971. An act to authorize the National Urban Search and Rescue Response System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4419. An act to update the financial disclosure requirements for judges of the District of Columbia courts and to make other improvements to the District of Columbia courts.

H.R. 5785. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for an annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on December 1, 2016, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 4665. To require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an assessment and analysis of the outdoor recreation economy of the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 2, 2016, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7689. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — DoD Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP) [Docket ID: DOD-2013-OS-0230] (RIN: 0790-AJ16) received November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7690. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing

and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Equal Access to Housing in HUD's Native American and Native Hawaiian Programs — Regardless of Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity [Docket No.: FR-5861-F-03] (RIN: 2506-AC40) received November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7691. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2015 Outcome Evaluations of Administration for Native Americans (ANA) Projects Report to Congress, pursuant to Sec. 811(e) of the Native American Programs Act of 1974, as amended; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7692. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7693. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; MA; Decommissioning of Stage II Vapor Recovery Systems [EPA-R01-OAR-2015-0351; A-1-FRL-9950-92-Region 1] received November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7694. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2015 Revisions and Confidentiality Determinations for Data Elements Under the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule [EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0526; FRL-9954-42-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS60) received November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7695. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a six-month periodic report, covering May 15, 2016 to November 15, 2016, on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, and has been continued by the President each year, most recently on November 8, 2016, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7696. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commerce Control List: Removal of Certain Nuclear Nonproliferation (NP) Column 2 Controls [Docket No.: 160718621-6621-01] (RIN: 0694-AH04) received November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7697. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary General License: Extension of Validity [Docket No.: 160106014-6728-04] (RIN: 0694-AG82) received November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7698. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy

and a notification of a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7699. A letter from the Acting Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Veterans' Preference (RIN: 3206-AM79) received November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7700. A letter from the Acting Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Career and Career-Conditional Employment (RIN: 3206-AM64) received November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7701. A letter from the Deputy Assistant to the President and Director, Office of Administration, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the personnel report as required by 3 U.S.C. 113 (2016), for personnel employed in the White House Office, the Executive Residence at the White House, the Office of the Vice President, the Office of Policy Development (Domestic Policy Staff), and the Office of Administration for FY 2016; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7702. A letter from the Acting Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program Coverage for Certain Firefighters and Intermittent Emergency Response Personnel (RIN: 3206-AM66) received November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7703. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report titled "Fiscal Year 2015 Report to Congress on Contract Funding of Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act Awards (Includes Fiscal Year 2012-2015 Data)", pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 450j-1(c); Public Law 93-638, Sec. 106(c) (as added by Public Law 106-260, Sec. 9(2)); (114 Stat. 733); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7704. A letter from the Division Chief, Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation [17X.LLWO310000.L13100000.PP0000] (RIN: 1004-AE14) received November 18, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7705. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Oil and Gas Extraction Point Source Category — Implementation Date Extension [EPA-HQ-OW-2014-0598; FRL-9955-65-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF68) received November 28, 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.

7706. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim final rule — Debt Refinancing in 504 Loan Program (RIN: 3245-AG79) received November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Small Business.

7707. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Infection and for Evaluating Functional Limitations in Immune System Disorders [Docket No.: SSA-2007-0082] (RIN: 0960-AG71) November 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7708. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — The U.S. Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Business Travel Card Program [Docket No.: USCBP-2013-0029] (RIN: 1651-AB01) received November 21, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

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 Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6415. A bill to provide for the appointment of members of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance to replace members whose terms expire during 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOST, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 6416. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and 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. KENNEDY (for himself and Mrs. LOVE):

H.R. 6417. A bill to prohibit a court from awarding damages based on race, ethnicity, gender, religion, or actual or perceived sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 6418. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 6419. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that COPS grant funds may be used to hire and train new, additional career law enforcement officers who are residents of the communities they serve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 6420. A bill to improve the screening of transgender persons at airport security checkpoints, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 6421. A bill to provide for the consideration of a definition of anti-Semitism for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or

activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 6422. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat qualified alternative commuter programs as an excludable qualified transportation fringe benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 6423. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to provide justice to victims of fraud; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.J. Res. 104. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BASS, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Con. Res. 177. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World AIDS Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. Con. Res. 178. Concurrent resolution clarifying any potential misunderstanding as to whether actions taken by President-elect Donald Trump constitute a violation of the Emoluments Clause, and calling on President-elect Trump to divest his interest in, and sever his relationship to, the Trump Organization; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 6415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to

make laws governing the commerce among several states, including employment discrimination laws.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 6416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 6417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and the 14th Amendment

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 6418.

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. LEWIS:

H.R. 6419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 6420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 6421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 6422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, which states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes," and Article I, Section 7, which states "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 6423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. COHEN:

H.J. Res. 104.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 169: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 546: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 590: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1061: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1147: Mr. DAVIDSON.

H.R. 1220: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1421: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1707: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1787: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2197: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2274: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2461: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2493: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2747: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 3244: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3559: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4296: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 4298: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANDEVIN, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 4376: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4456: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4731: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 4907: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 5090: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. YODER, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 5167: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 5258: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 5296: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 5334: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 5474: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 5501: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 5932: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 5956: Mr. LEWIS and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 5961: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 5999: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee

H.R. 6045: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 6100: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 6117: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 6132: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 6273: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 6306: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 6316: Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 6317: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 6336: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 6340: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KIND, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. O'Rourke.

H.R. 6377: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 6382: Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. MENG, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KIND, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Con. Res. 159: Mr. COOK and Mr. MARINO.

H. Con. Res. 161: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Con. Res. 171: Mr. OLSON, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. VARGAS.

H. Res. 753: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H. Res. 924: Mr. HECK of Washington.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2016

No. 172

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, thank You for the joy of Your surprises. You do more for us than we can ask or imagine.

Keep the hearts of our Senators steadfast toward You. Lord, lead them safely to the refuge of Your choosing, for we know You desire to give them a future and a hope. Today, provide them with the power to do Your will as they more fully realize that they are Your servants. Give them the wisdom to make Your Holy Word the litmus test by which they evaluate each action as they refuse to deviate from the path of integrity. May they maintain a conscious void of offense toward You or humanity.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The majority leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO HAL ROGERS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning I would like to pay tribute to a fellow Kentuckian who has devoted much of his life to public service, my good friend Congressman HAL ROGERS of Kentucky's Fifth District. HAL, of

course, just won reelection in his district with a modest 100 percent of the vote. I imagine he will serve here in Congress for many years to come, but his term as chairman of the House Appropriations Committee is drawing to a close at the end of this 114th Congress. So I thought it fitting to say a few words about the extraordinary tenure of this remarkable man.

HAL has served on the Appropriations Committee for more than 30 years and was selected as the 31st chairman 6 years ago. To mark the end of his chairmanship, family and friends and several special guests assembled a few months back in the House Appropriations Committee hearing room to unveil his official portrait as chairman of the committee.

HAL's portrait hangs alongside those of former chairmen, including some who went on to become Speakers of the House and, in the case of James Garfield, President of the United States. Adding his portrait to this distinguished group is the continuation of a century-old tradition. Many of HAL's colleagues, including Speaker RYAN, were on hand to mark the occasion of a well-deserved tribute to a man I have been honored to serve alongside for many years and to have known for even longer.

I first met HAL ROGERS several decades ago and later worked with him during the 1971 Kentucky gubernatorial campaign. While the Republican candidate that year, Tom Emberton, did not win the race, it was clear to me after getting to know HAL that he was destined for great things. Born in the small town of Barrier, KY, HAL became first a country lawyer in the town of Somerset and then the Commonwealth attorney for the region. He was first elected to the Congress with the Reagan revolution back in 1980 and is now the dean of Kentucky's congressional delegation.

Chairman ROGERS is legendary in Congress and back home for his relent-

less focus on the concerns and priorities of the people of the Fifth District. Long before the issue of opioid abuse dominated national headlines, HAL played an instrumental role in highlighting and preventing the scourge of drug abuse that has impacted many in Eastern Kentucky.

He has helped bring jobs and hope to the people of Southeastern Kentucky, thanks to projects like PRIDE, which promotes environmental responsibility, Operation UNITE, which helps fight substance abuse, and the Southeast Kentucky Economic Development Corporation, which encourages economic development and growth.

Through the years, HAL spearheaded numerous educational initiatives for all ages: Forward in the Fifth, Rogers Scholars, Rogers Explorers, and the Rogers Entrepreneurial Leadership Institute, just to name a few.

HAL helped launch TOUR Southern and Eastern Kentucky in order to boost tourism in the region and the Center for Rural Development as a way to help transform the area's economy. He has helped secure millions for the Kentucky National Guard, in which he proudly served, and the U.S. Forest Service for marijuana eradication efforts, and he recently spearheaded the Shaping Our Appalachian Region, or SOAR, initiative as a way to unite Kentucky's Appalachian counties around a common vision for attracting jobs and economic development to the region. He has also supported the Appalachian Regional Commission, pushed back against the Obama administration's War on Coal, and has earned a reputation as a tireless advocate for a strong national defense. I am proud to have worked closely with HAL on these and many other projects on behalf of the Bluegrass State.

His constituents can also be proud of the work that he has done for his Nation in his role as Appropriations

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6629

chair. Under his leadership, the Appropriations Committee responsibly refocused efforts on regular order, reviewing and approving all—I repeat all—12 annual government spending bills through the committee during his tenure. As chairman, HAL has made oversight of Federal spending a top priority, and his Appropriations Committee has held more than 600 hearings to ensure that Federal tax dollars were being spent properly. Under his leadership, the Appropriations Committee has gotten results, such as reducing wasteful spending by \$126 billion in total annual spending cuts since fiscal year 2010.

HAL is only the third Kentuckian to chair the House Appropriations Committee. The last was Congressman William Natcher, who held that position until 1994. He is, of course, the only Republican chairman from the Commonwealth. I know that becoming Appropriations Committee chairman was a great achievement for HAL and something he worked hard to earn.

Just on a personal note, I would like to add that HAL ROGERS is a great friend of mine. Elaine and I have always enjoyed spending time with him and his wife Cynthia. As the senior Republican in Kentucky politics, he has been a leader in getting things done for the benefit of the people of his district and of the Commonwealth for nearly four decades.

You can see his impact in many places. One can drive across the Hal Rogers Parkway in Southeastern Kentucky or visit one of the many institutions in service to Kentuckians. HAL is literally beloved in Southeastern Kentucky where he regularly wins reelection, as I indicated earlier, with an overwhelming majority of the votes.

HAL loves the people he serves. He is one of them. He is proud to champion their causes here in the Nation's Capital.

I thank Chairman ROGERS for his steady hand at the helm of the House Appropriations Committee for the last 6 years and for all he has done for Kentucky. Both Kentucky and the Nation are thankful for his service. As he turns his considerable energies to other important roles in Congress, I wish him the very best and look forward to partnering with him many more times in the future on behalf of the Commonwealth we both love.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will my friend yield for a brief comment?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am going to give a speech here in a minute regarding Senator MIKULSKI. But the reason I mention that is I want the record to reflect that Chairman ROGERS has been so nice to me whenever we have gone to public events and events dealing with the work of the Hill. He has been always a gentleman—I mean first class.

In meetings with just Democrats, I have heard Senator MIKULSKI talk about her great relationship with this

good man, so it has been pleasant for me to listen to the description of the relationship of the Republican leader and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I just wanted to take a minute and let everyone know that I have also been honored by his presence wherever it has been.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID VITTER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, after two terms in the Senate and more than two decades of public service, our friend and colleague Senator DAVID VITTER will be leaving us at the end of his term. I would like to say a few words before he does.

Our friend from Louisiana is the first Republican Senator popularly elected from his home State. It is an impressive achievement that history will long record. But Senator VITTER had little opportunity to celebrate at the time. Hurricane Katrina hit just a few months after he took office. It was a catastrophic natural disaster that presented massive and immediate challenges for Louisiana.

Our colleague did not miss a beat. Back home, he and his team worked tirelessly to set up mobile offices. Here in the Senate he fought hard to bring aid to those in need. It underlined something we have all come to know about Senator VITTER: He is passionate about his home State. That has been a constant throughout his career. He simply loves Louisiana. He loves the richness of its history, loves the richness of its culture, loves the richness of its food, too—crawfish pie etouffee and several other things I can't pronounce. Senator VITTER loves it all.

He flies home just about every chance he gets. When he was younger, he turned down offers from Harvard and Yale to study law in the Pelican State. This is after he spent some time in Cambridge, MA, and Oxford, as a Rhodes Scholar, by the way—pretty impressive—so perhaps it was born of a simple lesson: You're just not going to find alligator sauce piquante anywhere else.

Nor are you likely to find many Saints fans, certainly none as enthusiastic as our colleague. You will find Senator VITTER glued to a TV every football Sunday. If the Senate is in session, he will watch between votes in the cloakroom behind me. He has been a diehard fan of the Black and Gold for as long as he can remember. It was not as though he had much choice, of course, growing up in the Big Easy, but he has stuck by his team through thick and thin—often thin. It is what made the Saints eventual Super Bowl win in 2010 that much sweeter. He called it a dream come true.

This tenacity and determination carries over to his political career as well. Whatever the issue, Senator VITTER's staff says he is always looking for solutions that can improve the lives of Louisianans. They say he is always ready to roll up his sleeves and stay

the course on legislation that will do just that.

Senator VITTER has worked hard to protect his constituents from the effects of hurricanes and floods before they occur and to rebuild when they do. He has taken the lead on important initiatives to reform the Army Corps of Engineers and improve our Nation's waterways.

Most recently, he helped to pass the first significant reform of the Toxic Substances Control Act in nearly four decades. Senator VITTER was a critical player throughout, working across the aisle with our late colleague Senator Lautenberg and then Senator Udall to steer this much needed legislation to passage and eventually law.

Senator VITTER says he believes his most important job is to keep an open-door policy for constituents who need help. I know he would tell you that, although it may not be the most publicized part of the job, he considers it the most fulfilling.

He still remembers the woman in desperate need of a liver transplant. With the help of his office, she got it. He still remembers the veteran who needed an operation to save his leg and his life. With the help of Team Vitter, he received that too.

Senator VITTER will never forget the countless families in need of assistance following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the oil spill, and recent flooding. He has seen firsthand the life-changing, even lifesaving impacts constituent casework can have. It is what inspired him to compile these powerful stories and best practices into a constituent service guidebook that will help guide his successor from day one.

Of course, none of this would have been possible without a great staff, and Senator VITTER has built a strong team that is as committed to the people of Louisiana as he is. It is tight-knit. It is loyal. It is a group of men and women who know they have a boss who takes genuine interest in their success, who trusts their judgment, and who is always eager for their input.

Senator VITTER awards a Reform Trophy each week to the staffer with the best new policy idea. He truly believes in a heavy dose of competition. That includes when his son Jack is in town. Staffers can expect to be enlisted in an entirely different competition then; it is called Office Olympics. Team Vitter knows to bring their A game when Jack is around. They also know to bring their sense of humor. It turns out Jack is a bit of a prankster. I hear you don't want Jack laying hands on a Post-it note or a roll of aluminum foil when he is in the office, but lifelong memories are often made when he does just that.

It is these relationships and it is this capacity to make a difference for the people of Louisiana through constituent service and the legislative process that I am sure our colleague will miss most when he leaves the Senate.

Senator VITTER may be retiring from his post in this Chamber, but we know he will continue to look for ways to serve the State he loves so much. Today we join with his team and his family in recognizing his many years of service. I know each of us is looking forward to seeing what else our colleague is able to achieve on behalf of Louisiana in the years to come.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield for one moment, I want to thank the majority leader for his very kind words. Serving in the Senate for two terms has been the highest honor of my professional career. I have enjoyed it so much and have been honored by the relationship with all of my colleagues, certainly including the majority leader. I will have a few more reflections next Monday, but I sincerely thank him and also congratulate him for getting the Senate, particularly in the past 2 years, back to working order and some of its best practices. Not as a Member but as a cheerleader on the outside, I will be very much looking forward to even greater successes this coming Congress.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my colleague.

I have one more statement, and then I will be through.

21ST CENTURY CURES BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the House passed the 21st Century Cures bill with overwhelming bipartisan support, and I hope to see the same in the Senate. The medical innovation bill is one that can have a substantial impact for families across our country. It supports medical research, including promoting regenerative medicine. It provides real funding to help combat the prescription opioid epidemic that swept our Nation, particularly in places such as my home State of Kentucky. It improves mental health programs, among other bipartisan priorities.

I thank Senator ALEXANDER, chairman of the HELP Committee, for his tireless work in driving this critical legislation forward. We should also thank Senator HATCH, who worked with our Finance colleagues on a significant number of Medicare provisions in the package to protect care for America's seniors. I would like to note the great work by Senator CORNYN and Senator CASSIDY to incorporate key mental health reforms into the Cures legislation.

Let's work together to send it to the President's desk as soon as possible.

IRAN SANCTIONS EXTENSION BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later today we will have a chance to pass the Iran sanctions extension legislation that passed the House by a large margin.

Given Iran's continued pattern of aggression and the country's persistent

efforts to expand its sphere of influence across the region, preserving these sanctions is critical. This is even more important given how the current administration has been held hostage by Iran's threats to withdraw from the nuclear agreement and how it has ignored Iran's overall efforts to upset the balance of power in the greater Middle East.

The authorities extended by this legislation give us some of the tools needed to, if necessary, impose sanctions to hold the regime to account and to keep the American people safer. Next year I expect the new administration and new Congress will undertake a total review of our overall Iran policy. These authorities should remain in place as we address how best to deal with the Iranian missile test, their support for Hezbollah, and their support for the Syrian regime.

I urge all Senators to support this legislation later today.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA MIKULSKI

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at times it seems that Democrats and Republicans in the Senate don't agree on very much, but the one thing we all agree on without any exception is this: Our colleague BARBARA MIKULSKI of Maryland can turn a phrase better than anyone else. It is one of her many gifts. Just listen to some of the memorable lines we have heard her utter.

Running for her first term in the Senate, Barbara said:

I might be short, but I won't be overlooked.

Just prior to the 2013 government shutdown, she told Senate Republicans:

You can huff and puff for 21 hours, but you can't be the magic dragon that blows the Affordable Care Act away.

Earlier this year, she spoke of the Zika virus as follows:

The mosquitoes are coming. The mosquitoes are already here. You can't build a fence to keep them out, and the mosquitoes won't pay for it. The mosquitoes are here—this is not an Obama fantasy.

My personal favorite was something she said at a welcome reception for the 1986 class. We gathered in the Russell Building, and it was a festive occasion for Democrats. We had many new Democrats. It was a huge class—Daschle, SHELBY, Breaux, GRAHAM, Conrad, and Fowler. There were many Democratic Senators, but the day was stolen by BARBARA MIKULSKI. We were all asked to say a word. About her opponent, she stood and said: "I may be short, but it sure wasn't hard for me to slam dunk Linda Chavez," her opponent.

It is safe to say that with that quip, BARBARA immediately hit it off with all the Members of the Senate class.

From the moment she first set foot in the Senate, Senator MIKULSKI was determined to be herself—honest, disciplined, principled, undaunted, with an incredible wit and a fierce love of Maryland.

You will not find a Member of this body more devoted to her circumstances—and we will talk about those in a little bit—devoted to her constituents and her State than Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI. She served the State of Maryland for more than 50 years. A graduate of Mount Saint Agnes College and the University of Maryland, she made her name as a social worker and a political activist.

Her grandparents are well known, especially her grandmother. They ran a bakery. I have heard her talk about that bakery so many times, how the people in the neighborhood would come and wait for that bakery to open. Her grandparents went there very early, as bakers do. She speaks with nostalgia, warmth, and love of her grandparents.

Her own parents ran a little grocery store next to a steel mill. They would get there early in the morning, and the steelworkers would come and get their lunches and sometimes their breakfasts in that grocery store. Her parents were part of her life, as were her grandparents. She is so proud of them.

In 1966 the Baltimore City Council proposed building a large highway through the center of the city of Baltimore. There was a downside to the plan: It would have razed entire neighborhoods, African-American neighborhoods and especially immigrant neighborhoods. They would have to leave their homes.

The city's leaders, political bosses, and, of course, the wealthy real estate interests and many others—the power brokers of the State of Maryland, the city of Baltimore—knew this was a done deal, but the power brokers didn't count on a young social worker named MIKULSKI to fight for these families. It was her first political activism, and activism it was. It was her alone. Because of her magnetism, her warmth, and her ability to organize, she organized an effort to stop the highway. Everyone said it couldn't be done, but no one bothered to tell BARBARA. She rallied the citizens of Baltimore in opposing the highway, and what a rally it was—not one rally, not two, but many of them until it was determined that she had won and the power brokers had lost. These people got to keep their homes, and today there is no superhighway towering over the center of Baltimore. People remember BARBARA MIKULSKI for that.

BARBARA's fight against the highway made her a hero in Baltimore and propelled her to the city council in 1971. In 1976 BARBARA MIKULSKI fought her way to the Congress of the United States as a Member of the House of Representatives. After five terms in the House, BARBARA MIKULSKI ran for a seat in the Senate, in the one I just told you about. She slam-dunked her opponent,

making her the first Democratic woman in history to win seats in both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. Today Senator MIKULSKI is the longest serving woman to serve in the U.S. Congress. For more than 40 years she has served the people of Maryland.

She is the first woman and first Marylander to chair the prestigious Senate Appropriations Committee. Her legislative record reflects her hard work for women and for equality. She worked with then-Senator JOE BIDEN to pass the first Violence Against Women Act in 1994. She was the architect of the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. She was repeatedly in the forefront to fight for paycheck fairness, which determined that men and women who do the same work should be paid the same money.

When so many of us were duped by misinformation about the Iraq war, BARBARA MIKULSKI was not duped. She voted against the war.

BARBARA's career in the Senate has been historic, but I would be remiss if I failed to note her impact on my life and my career. As I said, we came to the Senate together. We served together. We got the same committees. We, of course, served together in the House, but that is a huge body—435 Members. Frankly, I served there two terms. I know the Presiding Officer served in the House. It is a huge body. When I left there after 4 years, I can remember a vote taking place. Where did these people come from? It is hard to get to know 435 people, but I knew BARBARA. Everybody knew BARBARA. But in the Senate we came together, served on the same committees, and we got to know each other very well early on. BARBARA MIKULSKI has always protected me, looked out for me.

One of my first memories took place right here in the well. I was new, she was new, and it was a very close vote. It was an issue that was her issue, and I couldn't vote her way. That happens here. It was a close vote. People were nudging me: You have to change. You are going to upset everybody. You are a Democrat; you can't do that.

I walked BARBARA MIKULSKI into this crowd. I was there. I was really kind of afraid, but she wasn't. She walked in. People moved away. She said: "Leave him alone. It is a matter of principle." People left me alone. That is who she is. Was she disappointed? I know she would have been disappointed had I not done what I believed in.

I served for 10 years with John Ensign, the Senator from Nevada. John and I had a unique relationship. In 1998 I won an election for the Senate between Ensign and REID by 428 votes. That was a close election. But as fate would have it, 2 years later he came to the Senate. Senator Bryan retired, and he came to the Senate.

Well, John had some personal issues. He hadn't been here very long at all and had some personal issues. I called

him at home, and he said: Yes, I have some problems here. I thought how I could help him. Here in the Senate we have the right to do what is called pair. Senator Ensign and I rarely voted alike anyway. So I said: Well, John, what I will do, so it won't affect your voting record, is that I will just pair with you and that way it won't show you have missed votes. So I agreed to do that, and for 2 weeks I told him I would do that.

Well, it worked out fine because we voted differently on everything, except there came an issue that affected Senator MIKULSKI. She came to me and said: Why are you voting that way? I told her: Senator Ensign has a personal issue, and I told him I would pair with him. She said: If you had done anything else—and I won't use her exact language—you would have been a fool. I wasn't a fool in her mind. Even though it was not good for her, she was supportive of me. She would not have been satisfied that I had done something that was wrong in her mind, and she accepted my explanation and that I had to do what I did. We have always had a lot of respect for each other.

Senator David Pryor of Arkansas had a heart attack and became very, very ill. He was a wonderful Senator. Everyone liked him. But he announced he couldn't serve as secretary of the Democratic caucus, and that was something that I was interested in. But I also heard BARBARA MIKULSKI was interested in it. She had been so good to me so often that I immediately went to BARBARA, and with the two of us together, I said: BARBARA, do you want this secretary's job? She said: Yes. I said: You have it. That was the end of that. Nobody opposed her.

Well, surprisingly, a few years later, out of nowhere, Wendell Ford, who was the whip, decided he wasn't going to run for reelection. It was a surprise to everyone. He was assistant Democratic leader, and that was something I was interested in, but again there was MIKULSKI. I didn't say a word. The word was out there that I was interested in it. So as fate would have it, I was walking from my office in the Hart Building over toward the Russell Building, and she was coming in the other direction. Those of us who know BARBARA know that a lot of times she is a person of few words. She is not a gadfly. Sometimes she talks a lot, but sometimes she doesn't want to talk. We were passing each other in the hall, and she said: I want to talk to you for a minute. She said: You took care of me in the Senate; the whip's job is yours. That ended it. It was all over. When that was done, I had a clear route to be the whip of the Senate—the Democratic Senate.

That is the relationship I have with BARBARA MIKULSKI. So she is as responsible as anyone for my years in Democratic leadership. Without her friendship and her loyalty my last 20 years in the Senate would have been much, much different. Working with BARBARA MIKULSKI is one of the highlights of my

congressional career. Just hearing her speak is a privilege.

I have seen and listened to good orators. When I was in the House—and my friend, the Democratic whip is here—we heard Jim Wright. Jim Wright was a great orator. He was the majority leader and the Speaker of the House. He was really good. Tom Lantos, an immigrant from Hungary, could speak. He was so dynamic, so good. Claude Pepper had a different style but was someone you listened to. Here in the Senate I have listened to some great orators. Back there was Dale Bumpers. I can still see him. He had a long cord here. He had an extra-long one, and he would walk up and down these aisles speaking. He was a great orator. I listened to him. George Mitchell, one of my predecessors, was so good, so articulate—and DICK DURBIN, from Illinois. They are all terrific orators.

But in my estimation, there is no better orator who I have come across in my congressional service than BARBARA MIKULSKI. We have talked about her one-liners, but I would like, just for a minute, to talk about a trip I took with a congressional delegation led by the very famous John Glenn—war hero, astronaut, and gentleman. We went to places in Europe. The Iron Curtain was down. We went to Poland. BARBARA MIKULSKI's heritage is Polish. They called in John Glenn to give a speech. Ted Stevens from Alaska was also on that trip. I said: We have someone here who is of Polish heritage. Let's listen to her. Oh, what a speech—I mean it was spellbinding. She talked about how she felt about who she was and about her grandparents and her parents.

So I know there is no better orator than BARBARA MIKULSKI. That is because she speaks from the heart. She is honest and so genuine. As the Baltimore Sun wrote: "People know authenticity when they see it, and there's nothing fake about BARBARA MIKULSKI, most especially her love of her job." That is pretty good, coming from the biggest newspaper in the State.

BARBARA has loved her job in the Senate, and the people of Maryland and the United States have loved having her as their advocate and defender. She leaves the Senate as she entered it, as a political activist and a fighter.

So, BARBARA, thank you very much for your guidance, your mentoring, your friendship. It has been an honor to work by your side. We are forever friends. Godspeed, BARBARA MIKULSKI.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Democratic whip.

SENIOR SENATOR FROM
MARYLAND

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me just echo the comments of our Democratic leader, Senator REID, in relation to Senator MIKULSKI. I will save a few moments perhaps next week to speak my own tribute to her and give my own reminiscences. But I didn't want to abruptly change the subject without saying I am in total agreement with Senator REID in terms of the quality of service and friendship that we have had with the senior Senator from the State of Maryland.

DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning to talk about an issue that I have raised many times from this very spot, and it is an issue relative to the undocumented young people living in America—undocumented because they are not legally in this country. They were brought here—many of them as infants, toddlers, or children—by their families. They were not aware of the family decision, other than the fact that they were in a car and moving into the United States. They didn't really appreciate where they came from. Many of them never knew where they came from. Some of them don't even speak the language of the country of their birth. They were brought here as children. They believed from the beginning they were part of America. In most, except in extraordinary circumstances, they were not even told of their immigration status at an early age.

So they grew up going to school in America. They learned English. They pledged allegiance to the only flag they had ever known. They sang the national anthem of this country believing they were part of this country. At some point, though, there was this realization and disclosure that they were not. Legally, they weren't. They were undocumented.

So these children were raised in the shadow of uncertainty—uncertain as to whether a knock on the door at any time of day or night might change their world forever; whether or not their parents might be deported from this country and they would have to go with them; or, God forbid, that something would happen to them and they would be deported. They lived with that fear for a long time.

I came to understand it when a Korean girl in Chicago who was looking for an opportunity to go to college because of her musical skills, realized she was undocumented and might not be able to do it. So she came to our office, told us of her situation, and we tried to help.

So 15 years ago I introduced a bill called the DREAM Act. The DREAM Act said that for young people brought to this country under the age of 16 and

who have lived here successfully, completed school, and have no criminal record to disqualify them, we should give them a chance—give them a chance to become legal in America and give them a chance, from my point of view, to become citizens. I introduced the bill 15 years ago. It has been debated. The word DREAMer came out of it and has now become pretty well-known across America to describe this group of young people.

A few years ago, I prevailed on the President of the United States, Barack Obama, to give them a fighting chance to stay here. So by Executive action, he created something called DACA. DACA is the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program. This would allow these young people, undocumented, to step forward and disclose their status, come up with a filing fee of almost \$500, and go through a process where they were submitted to a criminal background check. If they cleared all the hurdles, they would be given a temporary—underline the word temporary—right to live in the United States without fear of deportation and to work in this country.

So over the years, since the President's Executive action, 744,000 young people have come forward. Their lives are amazing. I have told their stories over and over. Imagine, if you will, that you lived in fear of being deported tomorrow or fear that your family would be broken up and how that would weigh on you as a young person. So they did something that was maybe rash in the eyes of their parents but heroic in my eyes. They stepped forward, out of the shadows, and said: If the United States of America has set legal standards for us to follow to stay here, we will comply with them. Their parents warned them and their friends warned them: You are turning yourself in. You are telling this government who you are, where you are, and where they can find you. But they did it anyway, and I encouraged them to do it, and many others did as well, saying: If you show good faith in this country, good faith in this government, I will do everything in my power to make sure it isn't used against you.

Now we have reached a new stage in our history with a new President coming who has different views on immigration than the outgoing President. My concern, and a concern shared by millions across America, is this: What is going to happen to these young kids—744,000 of them—who are currently in college, in high school, in professional schools, such as medical schools and law schools? They are doing amazing things with their lives, and yet things could happen immediately to change their status.

I have talked to a number of my colleagues on the floor on both sides of the aisle about this, and there are pretty strong emotions about helping these young people. One of the leaders on this has been my friend and ally on immigration issues—on some immigra-

tion issues—and that is LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina. He and I talked about introducing legislation that would give a temporary stay so these young people could be protected until Congress does its work and comes up with an immigration bill that addresses this issue and many more.

Senator GRAHAM and I discussed it again this morning, and we even hope to have this bill ready before we leave next week—a bipartisan effort to say to the new President: Give these young people a fighting chance. At least protect them until we have had a chance to act on the larger immigration issues before us. I hope that colleagues on both sides will join us.

There has been a lot of talk about what the next Congress will look like and what we will do, how we will tackle the biggest issues of our time. The Affordable Care Act, for example, which I was proud to support, is clearly controversial. There wasn't a single Republican Senator who voted for it. Some want to repeal it and replace it. Some are suggesting we will repeal it, but do it with 2 years in advance.

So 2 years from now there might be a new Affordable Care Act. That puts us in a responsible position of coming up with an alternative in that period of time. I don't know if that is how this conversation will end, but I would suggest the same logic could apply when it comes to immigration: At least give us the time to come up with an alternative on immigration, and during that period of time, let us protect these youngest people.

The stories I have told on the floor say more about this issue than any words I can express, and I want to tell another one of those stories this morning. This is about a young man from Illinois. His name is Asael Reyes. Here is his picture. He has his University of Illinois at Chicago T-shirt on. He is an interesting young man.

He came to the United States at the age of 5, brought here from Mexico. He grew up on the North Side of Chicago. He is a bright young man, but he learned he was undocumented early in life. He really got despondent over the thought that he could lose everything and have to be forced to leave America. His classes were a challenge to him, and with this fear in his mind he started doing very poorly. In fact, he dropped out of high school. He said it weighed heavily on his mind that he might have to leave.

He said:

I felt that because of my status, I had no future. As a result, my grades and attendance plummeted and I struggled to do anything productive.

Then, in 2012, President Obama announced DACA, and everything changed for Asael Reyes. Here is how he explains it:

DACA meant that I had a future worth fighting for, and because of that I returned to school and reignited my passion for study. Because of DACA, I want to do whatever I can to contribute to my country.

When Asael says “my country,” he means the United States of America—the only country he has ever known.

In his senior year in high school, this young man turned his life around because of DACA. He improved his grades, he was active in his community, he was head of his school’s fund raising committee, he volunteered in a mentoring program, and he worked full time to support himself and his family. You see, young people like him—undocumented—don’t qualify for any Federal assistance to go to college. If you want to go to college, you have to pay for it. For most of them, it means working pretty hard to come up with the money to do it.

Today Asael is in his sophomore year in the Honors College—the Honors College—at the University of Illinois at Chicago. He is a double major in psychology and political science, and he has a perfect 4.0 grade point average. Talk about a turnaround. He is involved with student government, leads a recreational bike club called College of Cycling. Every week he delivers food from the college dining halls on bike to a local homeless shelter. This effort has inspired other student groups to start similar initiatives. He mentors middle school students, and he is the youngest board member of the Erie Neighborhood House—a place I have visited many times—a social service agency that provides assistance to low-income families in the city of Chicago. In addition to all this, he works part time as a security guard at local events like Cubs baseball games and Bears football games.

Asael dreams of working in Chicago’s city government someday. He says: “I have a passion for my city, and I feel an obligation to do whatever I can to make it great by serving its communities.” This is one story—one story out of 744,000.

Will America be better if Asael Reyes is given his chance to stay here to make this a better nation? Of course, it will. At an early age, this young man was able to do a turnaround just on the hope that someday he might be able to live in this country legally.

There are so many stories just like his. In that same city of Chicago, at Loyola University School of Medicine, there are 28 students who are undocumented. The school opened up competition, and some of the brightest kids around America for the first time saw a chance for an undocumented student to be a doctor.

They have to sign up, incidentally—borrowing the money from the State of Illinois for their education—to serve a year of their lives as doctors in underserved areas of Illinois, in rural areas, and in the inner city, for each year they go to medical school. They willingly do it. They are prepared to give back. Asael is prepared to give back. The question is, Will we give them a chance?

I am not an expert in the area of social media, but yesterday we tweeted a

short message about this DACA challenge and what is going to happen to these 744,000 young people across America. The hashtag “save DACA” went out. My staff reports to me—and they are expert on this, I am not—in the span of 2 hours, we were trending across the United States of America. Six million people saw this hashtag over 10 million times. Think of that, 6 million people in 2 hours. It touched them what can happen to this young man and so many others.

So will Congress rise to this challenge? Will Democrats and Republicans come to the rescue of these young people who are asking for just a chance—brought to this country not by their decision but the decision of their parents—asking for a chance now to have a life? I hope we will. It will be good for them. It will sure be good for America.

TRIBUTE TO MARK KIRK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on January 3, there will be a new Senate sworn in. Members come down this aisle, to be sworn in over here by the Vice President of the United States, to become Members of the U.S. Senate. It will be the passing of the Senate seat in our State from Senator MARK KIRK to Senator-elect TAMMY DUCKWORTH. I would like to say a few words about my colleague MARK KIRK.

For the last 6 years, MARK and I have had a very positive professional relationship. The night he won the election, I was standing with his opponent Alexi Giannoulias when Alexi made the call to MARK KIRK to congratulate him. MARK asked that I take the phone, and I did.

He said: I want to work with you. I know we just competed against one another in the election, but we now have a responsibility together to represent the State of Illinois, and we started a positive working relationship—a relationship based on mutual respect. One of the things we did was to continue a tradition.

Since 1985, my mentor and colleague in the House, and my predecessor in the Senate, Paul Simon of Illinois, started a Thursday morning breakfast, inviting people from Illinois who were in Washington and those who wish they were from Illinois, to come in for free coffee and donuts at no taxpayer expense. It was an hour-long public meeting so we could talk about what was happening in the Senate and then answer any questions and pose for pictures if they wanted them. I asked MARK KIRK to continue this, even though we were of opposite political faith, and we did, for a long time. We worked together to make sure the people of Illinois felt welcomed. We often took differing views on issues—that is understandable—but we did it in a civil way. People said they thought it was one of the highlights of their trip to see two Senators from two different parties working together. We did—and not just on those Thursday mornings. We found reasons to do it on the floor.

In the vast majority of cases, when it came to filling Federal judicial vacancies, MARK KIRK and I worked together to agree. Rarely did we disagree on those who needed to be chosen. As a result, we have had a pretty good record of filling vacancies in the State of Illinois.

Then, of course, it was in 2012 that a disaster struck and MARK KIRK suffered a stroke. It was almost a life-ending experience. He is lucky—lucky—to be alive today. He knows it, and we all know it too. I primarily kept in touch with his staff, and with him, during the course of his rehabilitation after that stroke. It was a calendar year he had to give to rehabilitation, to learn how to walk again and speak again and do the basic things we take for granted. It was an extraordinary show of courage and determination on his part.

Finally, before he could return to the Senate, I visited with him and saw him some 10 months after the stroke and realized the devastation he weathered and how much he had managed to recover because of his sheer determination. The one thing he told me, though, was that he was determined to come back to the United States Senate and walk up those steps right into the Senate Chamber. He was working every single day on treadmills and with rehab experts to reach that day when he could get out of a car and walk up those steps. He asked me if I would ask other Senators to join him—especially his close friend JOE MANCHIN, a Democratic Senator from West Virginia, and we did. That day came and it was an amazing day. He started at the bottom of those steps and worked his way up, all the way into the Senate Chamber, to the applause of his colleagues—Democrats and Republicans—all the way up those steps. We realized what an amazing recovery he had made.

Our colleague Tim Johnson of the State of South Dakota had gone through a similar devastating experience. MARK KIRK said many times, when he was about to give up, he thought, Tim Johnson got back to the Senate. I can get back there if I work hard enough. He did just that.

He was an exceptional colleague of mine in the Senate. There were a lot of things we agreed on. One of them was Lake Michigan. As a Congressman from the 10th Congressional District, which is on the shores of Lake Michigan, he was always committed to that lake.

After the election, when the results didn’t come out as he wished, I sat down with him and said: MARK, what do you want me to do in memory of your commitment to public service?

He said: Do everything you can to protect Lake Michigan. And I am going to. I asked his successor TAMMY DUCKWORTH to join me in that effort, and we will in his name and in his memory.

I thank him for the service he has given to our State, the service he has given our Nation as an officer in the

Navy Reserve, and for the years he put in as a staff member to Congressman John Porter, for the work he did in the House of Representatives representing the 10th Congressional District, and for his term in the United States Senate. It has been a pleasure and an honor to serve with him. Despite our political differences, I count him as a friend, as an ally, and as a true champion for the State of Illinois.

I wish my colleague MARK KIRK the very best in his future endeavors.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN SANCTIONS EXTENSION BILL

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to voice my support of the extension of the Iran Sanctions Act, which I believe we must treat as just one step in our continued efforts to counter Iran's destabilizing and nefarious actions throughout the world. This bill merely extends the basis of our extensive sanctions network against Iran aimed at crippling the Ayatollah's deadly pursuit of a nuclear weapon for 10 years.

The Iran Sanctions Act, which is part of the extensive network of sanctions that I helped author for the United States and our allies to levy against the Iranian regime, serves as the basis of the economic leverage that brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place. Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have authored and championed the foundation of our network of sanctions that crippled Iran's economy and kept its nuclear pursuits at bay. It has been my consistent position that the United States must address these nefarious activities apart from the nuclear portfolio. We need to send a signal to Iran that the United States, while meeting its obligations under the JCPOA, will continue to respond to other threatening and dangerous activities the Iranian regime has taken.

Throughout debate over the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, its proponents made a number of repeated claims. Among these were that it was crippling sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table and that in the event of a breach of the agreement, the United States and our implementing partners would have every authority to "snap back"—the term that was coined—the sanctions that have been lifted. If the sanctions architecture has expired, then we have no sanctions which we can snap back. These sanctions were in place when the JCPOA was authored and signed, and it follows that they should remain in place.

Many of the agreement's proponents argued that putting the JCPOA in

place would give the United States and our allies the opportunity to focus on countering Iran's more conventional threats to American security and regional stability. Since the nuclear agreement came into force, Iran has continued its efforts to destabilize the region and increase its power through proxy and terrorist networks.

Since we signed the nuclear agreement with Iran, Iran has been testing the agreement, testing our resolve, and quite literally testing long-range ballistic missiles. We have seen multiple ballistic missile tests in the past year and a half—in October and November of last year and in March and May of this year and one launch not far from U.S. naval vessels. We have seen American sailors humiliated and detained at gunpoint. Just this weekend, a vessel controlled by the IRGC—the Iranian Revolutionary Guard—pointed a weapon at a U.S. military helicopter in the Strait of Hormuz.

Iran continues to support a Houthi insurgency that toppled the legitimate Government of Yemen. It supports Shia militias in Iraq who seek to control the democratically elected Iraqi Government and bring it closer in line with Iran, threatening to return Iraq to civil war or worse. It supports Assad in Syria and continues to send millions of dollars and sophisticated weapons to Hezbollah and Hamas, threatening innocent civilians in Syria and Israel's security. It continues human rights violations and sustains an aging clergy who is losing touch with the hopes and dreams of young Iranians and moderates, an out-of-touch clergy who dominates the power structures and the security apparatus that restricts civil liberties and promotes its hegemonic regional destabilization. It has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East, capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, biological weapons, and continues to develop cyber war capabilities.

Iran continues its development of space-launch vehicles that can lead to a longer range missile capability. It has cooperated with North Korea on the transfer of ballistic missile technology. This is in addition to the fact that Iran has, by its own admission, violated the JCPOA itself. The International Atomic Agency reported that Iran has twice violated the terms of the agreement by producing more heavy water than the deal allows for. An excess stockpile of heavy water—a critical component of operating nuclear reactors—reduces Iran's nuclear breakout time. Yet, even with this violation, the United States and our implementing partners have upheld our end of the bargain.

As I have repeatedly said and which I outlined in the bill I authored earlier this year, we must take decisive action in response to Iran's behavior which is in violation, among other things, of the United Nations Security Council resolutions and threatens America's inter-

ests and regional stability. The United States must reserve the right to hold Iran accountable for all of its actions, and that is exactly what my legislation would do by imposing stricter sanctions tied to specific nefarious actions outside the nuclear portfolio.

After months of consultations with my colleagues in the Senate, outside experts, and constituents, I introduced a bipartisan bill, S. 3267, the Countering Iranian Threats Act, on July 14, just before Congress broke for recess. Its acronym, CITA, not only extends the Iran Sanctions Act, which we will do independently today, it also expands sanctions for ballistic missile development, support for terrorism, and other illicit Iranian actions, and it sanctions transfers of conventional weapons to or from Iran—the totality of Iran's dangerous behavior outside of the nuclear portfolio. Specifically, it requires the administration to identify the specific Iranians, persons, or entities that are engaged in these activities and then apply sanctions that freeze their assets and block their international travel and business interests. In this way, the sanctions are surgical and designed to avoid interference with the terms of the Iran nuclear deal.

We must provide leverage to seek necessary change in the conduct of the Iranian regime and hold Iran accountable for meeting its international obligations, including the terms of the JCPOA. We will improve the deplorable human rights situation in Iran and double down on our reassurances to Israel and American allies in the region of our full commitment to regional security.

The fact is, there is much we can do to ensure a bright future undimmed by a nuclear cloud. We must authorize the Iran Sanctions Act that I have authored so that, as flawed as the JCPOA was, in my view, the Iranians will know the consequences of any breach and we will deal with missile proliferation, terrorism, and regional destabilization that is just as dangerous and just as threatening to American security and to our ally, the State of Israel, and our other allies in the region. I hope we will get to that new phase in the next Congress.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today on another topic that is affecting every single State represented here in this Chamber, and that is the opioid epidemic. This is heroin, prescription

drugs, and increasingly the synthetic heroin coming into our State and poisoning the people we represent, leading to a situation where we have about 120 people dying every day of overdoses—about 5 a day in my State of Ohio. Unfortunately, I have to report today that it is getting worse, not better.

I also believe that Congress is beginning to take the right steps to address that, and that is what I want to talk about today. This is the 28th time I have come to the floor to talk about this issue this year because it is one that affects every State, but particularly mine.

I come from Ohio. It is a State that recently, based on a new report, was named as one of the top States in the country for overdoses and, unfortunately, the tragedy of overdose deaths.

For those who die from overdoses, it is a tragedy, of course. But, frankly, it is the tip of the iceberg because there are so many people whose lives are shattered, whose lives are torn apart, who are not going to work and whose communities are facing more and more crime because of this issue.

It was addressed here in this Chamber recently by the legislation I want to talk about today, but it is something we must find a way to deal with immediately because of the urgency of the problem. To this Senator, it is much like other public health crises that we face as a country, whether it is a Zika virus or other issues that come up where Congress has said that we need to have immediate funding and immediate changes in policies to address it. What Congress has done already and the President has signed into law as of a couple of months ago is broad legislation called CARA, or the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, and that legislation is historic in the sense that it is the first time in over 20 years that Congress has taken a look at this issue and come up with a comprehensive approach. It focuses on education and prevention to help people make the right decision and not get into the funnel of addiction, particularly focusing on young people. But it also focuses on better treatment services and recovery.

Right now there are people who cannot access treatment, and part of the problem is that there is not adequate funding for that treatment. Part of the problem is that there is a stigma attached to addiction and people aren't willing to come forward. Our legislation, broadly speaking, addresses that as well because it says that addiction is a disease and ought to be treated as such, which should help to get people into treatment.

For the first time Congress is supporting not just treatment and detox but actually getting people into longer term recovery programs. Think of housing arrangements or other supportive recovery services that we found from our experience in doing the research around the country, which are much more successful in terms of help-

ing people to turn their lives around and to lead a productive life. What we have found in the last 3 years with five conferences here in Washington, DC, bringing experts in from all around the country, is that this is something that can actually help to turn the tide. It is the first time Congress has focused on that. We also focused on the issue of ensuring that the law enforcement community and first responders—our firefighters and others—have access to this miracle drug called Narcan or naloxone, which is able to reverse the effects of an overdose. There is a program to allow them to apply to get the Narcan they need to help save lives, and it is amazing. It was administered 16,000 times in Ohio last year. This year it will be a lot more than that. Those are lives that are saved. It is not the ultimate solution. The solution is getting people into treatment and the recovery they need, but it is necessary right now given the epidemic that we face.

There are other aspects of the legislation, as well, that help ensure that we get the prescription drugs off the shelves, which unfortunately are being abused by having more drug take-back programs. We provide more resources to ensure that people can get the help they need in terms of treatment and recovery.

I am happy to say that the legislation is beginning to be implemented. I would ask the administration again today to expedite that implementation. Of the seven larger programs that are part of this legislation, I think it is fair to say that two are being implemented at this point already, and we need to move forward with others as well. I know it takes a while. We need to be sure that the programs are properly implemented. But again, there needs to be an urgency about this issue.

Section 303 of the legislation is being implemented now by the Department of Health and Human Services, as one example. It expands access to medication-assisted treatment by allowing nurse practitioners and physician assistants to prescribe medication-assisted treatment to help treat an opioid use disorder. This is important. Back in my home State, I am hearing a lot from people who are already training people to be able to provide this assistance to those who are addicted and need to have this medication-assisted treatment using methadone, Suboxone or Vivitrol. To allow nurse practitioners and physician assistants to participate in this is incredibly important. This is progress, but we are pushing the administration to implement the law even more quickly.

CARA also deals with the growing demand for drugs, as I said, by improving access to longer term recovery. Recently, I was able to go to a recovery house in Canton, OH, called the Phoenix Recovery Home. I was able to talk to some of the recovering addicts there, in one case several times where

it had not been successful, but this longer term recovery was working for them. Again, this legislation is so important to implement the recovery aspect of it.

The funding for this has also been a work in progress. We have made some progress toward increasing the funding. This year there is a 47-percent increase in funding for the opioid crisis. In the CARA legislation there is an authorization for additional funding in the amount of \$181 million every single year. That is important. That \$181 million every year going forward is something that will be important in this comprehensive approach.

In the short term, we are working under a short-term spending bill right now called the continuing resolution. We were able to get funding of \$37 million that expires next week. We have to be sure that funding continues. That is adequate funding to implement the program now, but we need to ensure that we have short-term funding over the next period of time, whenever that is—some say it will be from now until March—to ensure we keep CARA implemented.

What I am pleased to report today is that the 21st Century Cures legislation, which the House has sent over to the Senate, includes a dramatic increase in funding for this issue. It is about \$500 million per year over the next 2 years of additional funding that will be block-granted to the States for prevention and treatment. This is incredibly important to my State of Ohio and other States. My understanding is that States that have a higher prevalence of overdoses will be given priority in terms of these funding dollars. I think that is appropriate. It will be helpful to those States hardest hit.

I wish that some of the parameters of the funding instructions had been a little broader to include this issue we talked about earlier having to deal with the recovery aspect. But we are working to ensure that, as this legislation is implemented, the States have maximum flexibility to address this problem.

This legislation will be bipartisan. I think you will see the vote to be very bipartisan next week when we take it up, and in part it is because of this legislation. So between CARA and this new legislation in the Cures Act, we are going to see additional funding and it is urgent that we see it.

The Kaiser Family Foundation recently released a report based on information from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention that found that one in nine heroin deaths in the United States happened in our home State of Ohio. We have the most deaths from synthetic opioids, such as fentanyl and Carfentanil, that is coming into our communities. We are seeing unfortunately an increase not just in Ohio, but in other States around the country.

Every day I hear about this issue from Ohioans. Sometimes when I am back home at events that have nothing

to do with this substance abuse issue, people will come up to me, as they will this weekend, and talk about their personal stories.

Recently, I received a couple of letters. Just before Thanksgiving I got a letter from Elaine. She is from Cincinnati, my hometown. She wrote that her daughter was lost to a drug overdose in 2013 and her grandson from a drug overdose on August 1 of this year. She writes that her other son is now an active heroin addict. She went through a story about trying to get him into a detox center for treatment but she faced barriers. One of the barriers in her case was being able to afford it. The insurance initially wouldn't cover it. We tried to help her with that, but in the meantime, she is at her wit's end to do something now to save her son's life, having lost two other members of her family. Again, this legislation we are going to vote on early next week, the Cures Act will help with regard to Elaine's inability to find detox and treatment for her son.

Barbara in Columbus has been in touch with my office a lot. She lost her son Eric to an overdose in 2012. He was just a week shy of his 24th birthday. She writes that Eric wanted to go to rehab. His sister took him to every place in Columbus, and no one had room. There was no room at the inn. This is another issue we are finding across the country. Sometimes these resources are available in larger urban areas, but they are frankly oversubscribed given the issue of heroin and prescription drug addiction and the growing problem that we have. She writes:

We need to stop jailing people for drug use. We need to stop people from dying in the streets, and get them into treatment clinics. We need to recognize the difference between drug use and drug abuse. We need focus on creating a society where people do not feel the need to numb the pain of their existence through drug abuse.

I agree with her, and that is the focus of the legislation, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask for an additional 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, again, I am pleased that Congress has made so much progress in this area. I see my colleague from the Judiciary Committee is here, Senator LEAHY, who helped get this legislation through his committee, along with Senator GRASSLEY. It is called the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act.

Now we have a chance with the Cures Act to put even more funding immediately against this problem. I encourage my colleagues to support that legislation. It is good legislation for other reasons, as well, but also because of the fact that this epidemic of opioid abuse must be addressed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the work of my colleague, and I am glad to work with him on this.

JUSTICE FOR ALL REAUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on another subject, each morning in this Chamber, we pledge allegiance to our flag. We end by declaring that we are "one Nation under God with liberty and justice for all." I believe in those words, but it is not enough just to say the words. It is our obligation to bring meaning to this promise.

Today I hope that Congress will finally take an important step forward by passing the bipartisan Justice for All Reauthorization Act. I have long championed the Justice for All Act to make our justice system more fair. Our bill will strengthen indigent defense and expand the rights of crime victims. It will improve the use of forensic evidence, including rape kits, to provide justice swiftly. It will help protect the innocent by increasing access to postconviction DNA testing. The Senate passed this bipartisan legislation in June, and the House approved a slightly modified version earlier this week. I am disappointed the House decreased authorizations for many programs I support. Still, the bill makes important changes and will improve the lives of many of our most vulnerable citizens. I urge my fellow Senators to consent to its immediate passage.

As a former prosecutor, I am dedicated to ensuring that our criminal justice system has integrity and the confidence of the public it serves. I started out on the front lines as State's attorney in Chittenden County, VT. And for the past 20 years, I have served as chairman or ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. During that time, it has become clear to me that our system is deeply flawed—there is not always justice for all.

I have met many people who were wrongly convicted of crimes they did not commit. Kirk Bloodworth—let me tell you a story about Kirk Bloodworth, who is one such young man. He was just out of the Marines in 1984 when he was falsely convicted and sentenced to death for the rape and murder of a 9-year-old girl.

He always declared his innocence, but he was nearly executed, until DNA evidence proved he was innocent in 1993 and helped law enforcement find the person who actually committed the crime. He became the first death row inmate in the United States exonerated by DNA evidence.

I have always been impressed with his courage, but he was not the last. There were 149 innocent people exonerated just last year—in 1 year, 149—the highest number on record. Our justice system failed not only these innocent people, but also the victims of crime. Those of us who have been prosecutors

know what it means if you convict the wrong person, aside from the injustice to the person who was convicted. It means that somebody who committed the crime is still out there free and has not been arrested and has not been convicted. Our justice system failed not only these innocent people but also the victims of crime. We can and we must do more to fix this injustice.

I believe we should eliminate the death penalty entirely because I know the system gets it wrong. But until we do away with the death penalty, we must improve the integrity of our criminal justice system. That is why I joined with Kirk years ago to enact the Post-Conviction DNA Testing Grant Program. This was originally part of the Innocence Protection Act enacted in 2000, and it gives defendants like Kirk a chance to prove their innocence. That should not be too much to ask.

We can and we must do more to fix this injustice. We must do more to ensure that our justice system gets it right from the beginning. That means improving the quality of indigent defense. Our system too often fails to provide a lawyer for every person accused of a crime, even if they cannot afford one. Our Founding Fathers recognized that no system could be fair if accusations by a king or a government went unchallenged. Without a vigorous defense, it is impossible to determine who is actually guilty and who has been wrongly accused. This legislation requires the Department of Justice to provide technical assistance to States to improve their indigent defense systems, and it ensures that public defenders will have a seat at the table when States determine how to use their Byrne JAG criminal justice funding.

Improving systems of indigent defense will mean fewer innocent people behind bars. It is an outrage when an innocent person is wrongly punished. Of course, this injustice is compounded when the true perpetrator remains on the streets, able to commit more crimes. We lock up the wrong person, and the person who committed the crime is still out there to commit more crimes.

My brave friend Debbie Smith, a champion for victims of sexual assault, waited 6 years after being attacked before her rape kit was tested and the perpetrator, the criminal, was caught. Survivors like Debbie should not have to live in anguish, knowing their attacker remains free. Our bill provides resources for forensic testing. Specifically, it creates a new tracking system so testing can be done more efficiently. It will also expand access to forensic exams in rural areas and for underserved populations. Coming from a State like Vermont, I know how important that will be in rural areas.

Sexual assaults must be prevented wherever they occur, including in our Nation's prisons. That is why I strongly supported the Prison Rape Elimination Act when it was enacted in 2003. This bill imposes true accountability

by withholding Federal funds from States who do not implement protections to prevent sexual assaults in our prisons. It also protects grants designed to provide services for survivors of domestic and sexual violence.

Our legislation also builds on the landmark protections provided for victims of domestic violence in the 2013 Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Act. Imagine a woman living with an abusive partner in public housing, but her name is not on the lease. One night he beats her. She calls the police. The man is arrested. The woman believes she is finally safe. But then the landlord says she has to leave immediately because the man is being evicted and she has no right to stay. The Justice for All Act will allow this woman time to remain there while she either finds another place to live or she can demonstrate she is eligible to remain under her own name. No person should be forced to choose between abuse and a place to live.

And finally, our bill expands rights for victims of all crime. It builds upon the success of the Crime Victims' Rights Act by making it easier for crime victims to have an interpreter present during court proceedings and to obtain court-ordered restitution.

It has been my great honor to serve as the most senior Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee since 1997. During that time, I have worked with Senators from both sides of the aisle to craft solutions to some of the most important problems of our time. I am proud to join with my good friend the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN, on this legislation and the many advocates who have helped guide our work. I especially appreciate the work of the Innocence Project, the Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, the National Domestic Violence Hotline, the Consortium of Forensic Science Organizations, Just Detention International, the National Criminal Justice Association, the National District Attorneys Association, Legal Aid DC, the National Network to End Domestic Violence, the Joyful Heart Foundation, the ACLU, the National Juvenile Justice Network, and the National Center for Victims of Crime.

Senator CORNYN and I have proved this is not a Republican or Democratic issue; this is a justice for all issue. That is why so many in both parties have joined, along with so many people around the country.

As we consider legislation next Congress, we must remember that we have an obligation to look out for all victims and to create fairness in our criminal justice system. While we made some improvements this year, including passing the bipartisan Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act and the Sexual Assault Survivors' Rights Act, I am disappointed the Republican-led Congress failed to even allow a vote on bipartisan criminal justice reform legislation despite its strong support. As we look to the new

Congress, I hope those who worked with me on this important issue will continue to support efforts to correct the costly mistakes of mandatory minimum sentences. I hope we can again build the same kind of broad bipartisan consensus in support of all victims of sexual assault and domestic violence as we did last Congress when we passed the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act through the Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS AND VOTER RIGHTS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, it has now been 23 days since the election—3 weeks and 2 days. Certainly it has been a time of great frustration and anxiety for Americans across the board, anticipating what our government will look like, what our executive branch will look like under the leadership of President-Elect Donald Trump.

The early signs have been ones that have indeed given a great deal of concern to many groups across America, beginning with the appointment by Mr. Trump of a White nationalist as his Chief Strategist, an individual, Steve Bannon, who has run a Web site, Breitbart, that specialized in hate, specialized in division.

It certainly reverberated in the campaign, but to bring that into the White House was something very few people anticipated would occur. It has been followed up by other appointments that were certainly a cause of deep concern. Just yesterday, there was the nomination of Steve Mnuchin, a Wall Street banker being assigned to the key post in our economy, the Treasury Secretary post—a post that will come before this Chamber for confirmation.

This is not just someone from Wall Street but someone who specialized in acquiring a bank that had been deeply involved in predatory lending, proceeded to foreclosure on thousands and thousands of families, was using robo-signing to accelerate that in violation of the law, was a specialist in turning people out of their homes, profited enormously in the strategy at the expense of working Americans seeking to have the fundamental comfort of owning their own home.

There is a list of other appointments, nominees who have certainly more than raised eyebrows, raised anxiety, other individuals who have specialized in hate and division, and other incidents such as the attack on the cast of "Hamilton" for proposing that individuals with a background of hate and division not be put into the Cabinet.

Then we have this from our President-elect. I quote his tweet: "In addition to winning the Electoral College in a landslide, I won the popular vote if you deduct the millions of people who voted illegally."

It is a straight falsehood. It has been debunked by every major analytical group, news organization in America. It is a complete fiction created in the middle of the night by our President-elect, but why? I think most people conclude that the fact he lost the popular vote is so disturbing to the President-elect because he wants to claim a mandate, but he cannot claim a mandate because the majority of Americans voted against him. They have voted against his strategy of division. They have voted against his strategy of incurring hate against Muslims, against immigrants, against women, against Hispanics, against African Americans.

No, Donald Trump, you did not get the popular vote, you lost it. You lost it straight out by more than 2 million votes and perhaps a great deal more.

No fiction you can stir up in the middle of the night can change that fundamental fact that you have no mandate in America for these politics of hate and division.

The fact is, the citizens' vote against Donald Trump would have been far larger except for a strategy of voter suppression. Voter suppression is a crime against the Constitution. Our Nation was founded on the vision of citizens being empowered to have a direct voice.

President Jefferson wrote a letter in which he referred to the mother principle of our democracy. He described the mother principle as we can only claim to be a democratic republic to the degree that our decisions reflect the will of the people. Then he went on and said and that will only happen if the people, each person, has an equal voice. Then he went on to say that the biggest factor in equal voice is the power to vote.

We know the original Constitution was incomplete in this vision, that it did not provide that full empowerment to women or to minorities—flaws that we have addressed over time in this vision and understanding that the power to vote is fundamental to a democracy.

Indeed, President after President over the course of our Nation has recognized the power of the individual to vote as fundamental to our democratic Republic.

LBJ said: "The vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice and destroying the terrible walls which imprison men because they are different from other men."

Of course, he was referring to race and the battle over the Voting Rights Act in 1965.

FDR said: "The ultimate rulers of our democracy are not a President and Senators and Congressmen and Government officials but the voters of this country."

Robert Kennedy put it this way: “Each citizen’s right to vote is fundamental to all the other rights of citizenship.”

These are not simply ideas that Democrats put forward, these are not simply ideas that our Founders put forward, these are ideas that Republican Presidents have put forward.

Let’s turn to Ronald Reagan, who said: “For this Nation to remain true to its principles, we cannot allow any American’s vote to be denied, diluted, or defiled.”

Ronald Reagan was right and that is why voter suppression is wrong. It is an attack on the vision of our Nation in which citizens are in charge, not powerful elites, powerful special interests. Citizens are in charge. When you deliberately set out to take away the vote from citizens, you really are trying to shred the Constitution.

So those in this Chamber who have been so engaged in promoting voter suppression and your attack on our Constitution—because it is simply wrong. As Ronald Reagan put it, it takes away the power of the individual, it denies, it dilutes, and it defiles. Quit denying, quit diluting, and quit defiling. Honor the vision of this Nation in which citizens are in charge.

Unfortunately, we have seen quite the opposite. We have seen a systematic Republican strategy to tear down the power to vote in our Nation, and this must end.

The Supreme Court set the stage for this by saying enough years have passed that the Voting Rights Act, which required areas and counties that had been active in voter suppression in the past, to get preapproval for changes in their law so they wouldn’t go back to defiling and denying the right to vote, said: Enough time has passed. We can now trust them.

That Supreme Court decision was clearly a mistake because, immediately, jurisdiction after jurisdiction proceeded to enact voter suppression laws, often carrying out a debate deliberately about how to keep minorities from voting. This wasn’t something hidden. This wasn’t sneaky. This was straight out: We don’t want those people to vote who might vote against us.

I tell you what I believe in. I believe in our Constitution. I believe in the power of citizens to vote, to be the rulemakers in our country, to have Jefferson’s vision, his mother principle of a democratic republic to make decisions in accordance with the will of the people, not the will of the powerful, special interests who are driving this voter suppression attack on Americans’ right to vote.

A study of nearly 400 counties in Alabama, Arizona, Texas, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Mississippi found more than 860 polling places were eliminated in those counties. In Arizona, almost every single county shut down voting locations. More than half the counties in Louisiana, Texas, and Alabama did so. They provided data to the researchers.

Let’s take a look at North Carolina, a State that passed a voter suppression law which included restrictive voter ID, ending same-day registration, requiring votes cast at the wrong polling location to be thrown out, and shrinking the time for early voting a week—and which did these things after debating directly how to suppress the right of minorities to vote. That is an evil crime against our Constitution and against citizens of the United States of America. The law targeted African-American voters with what the Fourth Circuit of Appeals described as almost surgical precision.

The law was overturned by the court, but that didn’t stop the North Carolina Republican Party’s very direct efforts to suppress the vote, to eliminate early voting days—especially on Sunday, to severely curtail the number and hours of voting places, of closing all but one early voting location in largely African-American counties, and leaving 27 fewer polling locations than in 2012.

This strategy, successful in Mecklenburg County, which includes Charlotte and has more than 15 percent of the State’s Black voters. The State reduced early voting sites from 22 to 4. In three North Carolina counties with large African-American populations, the Republican Party put out a piece of mail and challenged thousands of voter registrations and tried to get them stripped from the rolls until the Federal court ordered them to stop.

Long lines were the result at polling places that “put early voting totally out of reach for people without the time or resources to travel long distances to vote.”

It is a crime against the Constitution, it is a crime against the citizens, and it significantly reduced turnout. It was successful.

In 2008, 70 percent of African-American voters in North Carolina voted early. The rough estimates are that about 10 percent fewer ballots were cast in North Carolina in 2016, and at least a substantial share of that change has to be attributed to these voter suppression efforts that produced those long lines and made it so hard for individuals to vote.

We saw glaring examples of voter suppression in Wisconsin, which has one of the strictest voter photo ID laws in the country. It is a law that by lower courts was ruled to serve no legitimate purpose, to make it unnecessarily harder to vote, and designed to disenfranchise African Americans, Latino students, the elderly people with disabilities, and low-income residents. It is a pure, partisan crime against the Constitution, a partisan crime against the citizens of Wisconsin.

As a result of this law, Wisconsin saw its lowest voter turnout in two decades for an election decided by fewer than 30,000 votes in the Presidential election.

Neil Albrecht, executive director of the Milwaukee Election Commission,

said: “Some of the greatest declines were in districts we projected would have the most trouble with voter ID requirements.”

That is not all. There were online voter suppression strategies. In the final days before the election, there were a series of ads put out that were claiming to be from Secretary Clinton’s campaign and basically said to folks “vote from home” by text message or online.

Well, of course, the law doesn’t allow people to vote by text message. It doesn’t allow people to vote online, although there may be a few exceptions around the country, the vast majority of places you cannot vote online.

We have come a long way technologically in this country, but by and large you still have to show up in person. You still have to vote your ballot. In Oregon, you have to fill out your ballot, drop it off or mail it in. In other places around the country, you have to show up in that voting booth, whether it be early voting or day-of voting.

An effort to mislead people is akin to the other voting suppression tactics where we have seen people put out messages that tell people the voting location has changed. People put out messages that the voting hours have changed. This—a new clever strategy—is saying: Don’t bother to go to the voting place, you can vote by text or you can vote online, encouraging people not to go to the polls.

When somebody does something like that, it should be a crime that puts them in jail for years, misleading voters about where to vote, the times to vote, or how you can legally vote. It should be a crime that puts people in jail for years. Why is that? Because it is an attack on the foundation of our democratic Republic, the right to vote.

It is this voter suppression strategy, a tactic which is completely at odds with the vision of a nation in which citizens are in charge—not powerful special interests, not powerful special interests like the Koch brothers who promised, in January of 2015, to put nearly a billion dollars into the 2016 election. The Koch brothers take credit for essentially controlling this Chamber. Indeed, their money played a key role in race after race after race. We saw it in 2014. We saw it this year in 2016.

What kind of Nation do we want? A nation where oil-and-coal billionaires control this Chamber, the Senate, or a nation in which the citizens control this Chamber, a nation in which we honor Jefferson’s mother principle or a nation in which we have handed over the keys to a few powerful special interests and billionaires.

Do we want a nation of, by, and for the people or a nation of, by, and for the powerful and the privileged? That is what is at stake here. A senior member of the Trump campaign publicly said: “We have three major voter suppression operations under way.”

One of those was Operation Project Alamo, the campaign’s custom online

database that contained detailed identity profiles on 220-million Americans. The point is, they used this information on more than 200 million Americans to target Secretary Clinton supporters with negative and misleading Facebook ads, the goal being voter suppression, as clearly stated by a senior member of the Trump campaign.

Well, let's go back to the principle laid out by President Ronald Reagan, and again I quote him: "For this Nation to be true to its principles, we cannot allow any American's vote to be denied, diluted or defiled."

So I call on my colleagues who have been the proponents of voter suppression, who have been the proponents of attacking the Constitution, who have been the proponents of government of, by, and for the most powerful and the most privileged rather than the people, to listen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I didn't hear how long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. No objection here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. I thank the Chair.

Those words should continue to reverberate in this Chamber. Colleagues, set your sights on the vision of ending your denying, diluting, and defiling of the most fundamental right close to the hearts of Americans and the foundation of a government of, by, and for the people. Only then will we have a government that responds to the real issues Americans face rather than the special goals of the most powerful and the most privileged.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

21ST CENTURY CURES BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, yesterday I spoke about the 21st Century Cures bill the House passed by a very large margin last night, and I am looking forward to taking up that legislation here in the Senate. I am particularly grateful that it includes some mental health reform legislation that I introduced here in the Senate. This represents the very first mental health reform in more than a decade, and it is high time we got it done. There are a lot of people who contributed to this effort, and I think it is something we can all be proud of.

With the mental health portion of the bill, we have two chief goals in mind—first, to help those who are mentally ill get the treatment they need, and secondly, to help law enforcement and first responders know how to respond to a potential mental health cri-

sis in order to keep the person they are responding to safe, as well as the first responders themselves.

It opens up existing funds so that they can be used for more outpatient treatment options. That way, local and State governments can help identify mentally ill offenders, assess their mental health needs, and get them in the right treatment to improve their condition, rather than sending them to jail, where they will be warehoused and their condition will likely just get worse and worse.

This legislation will also provide flexibility to State and local authorities so they can use what works in their communities to help mentally ill individuals in the criminal justice system get healthy. This could include things such as assisted outpatient treatments, where families can help their loved ones, with a backstop of court supervision so they will remain compliant with their doctors' orders and take their medication, which will allow them to lead productive lives.

This legislation will make available Federal grants so that our law enforcement officials have the resources to get the kind of training they need. When law enforcement officials are called to the scene of an incident with somebody suffering from a mental health crisis, it is very important that they know how to deescalate that crisis, both for the well-being of the individual suffering that crisis as well as the law enforcement officials responding.

It will allow the creation of more crisis-intervention teams comprised of law enforcement and first responders and even school officials, where appropriate, so they can rapidly respond to and counter a threat of violence in the community.

Yesterday I received messages from some of the people who have worked with us on this legislation and know all too well how mental illness can affect our families. One individual wrote:

After losing both [a] son and a husband to suicide, and having an adult son with bipolar disorder, I know only too well the frustrations of the mental health system. Thank you, Senator, for your determination and hard work to bring change to this broken system.

This is why these mental health reforms are so important. People need help and the mental health system needs reform, and that is why we need to pass the 21st Century Cures bill—for all the good it will do in addition to these important reforms in dealing with mental health challenges around the country. So I look forward to finishing the job next week and sending it to the President's desk.

MILITARY READINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Separately, Madam President, I come to the floor today to highlight a pressing national security concern that just doesn't get enough attention. Members often come to the floor to talk about specific military

threats that other nations pose to the United States, and that is good and right. For example, we have heard a lot about Iran this week as the Senate considers the Iran Sanctions Extension Act—a bill that will help ensure that President-Elect Trump and future Presidents will have the authority they need to reimpose sanctions on Iran, even in spite of President Obama's flawed nuclear deal which provided relief from these same types of sanctions and others without getting a whole lot of meaningful concessions from Tehran in return. This bill passed the House a few weeks ago with more than 400 votes, and I am glad there has been significant bipartisan support to move it forward here.

But today I want to talk about a problem that is partly of our own making, and that is threats to our long-term military readiness. It is no secret that our military leaders continually call on Congress to adequately fund the weapons programs that enable our troops to defend our Nation.

The major concern I have and one that is shared by leadership at the Pentagon is that our military's technological edge on the battlefield is being whittled away by other countries, such as China and Russia, that are working at breakneck speed, investing millions of dollars to erase our advantage in many areas of military capability. That means we have to wake up to the risks that are inherent in this situation and do more to invest in the next generation of weapons to meet the challenges on the battlefields of tomorrow. The nations that are most belligerent and hostile to America and our interests are not cutting back on their investment in military technology, so we simply do not have the luxury of being complacent.

Recently, I had a chance to meet with Under Secretary of Defense Frank Kendall, the Defense Department's top acquisitions person or top weapons buyer. He is charged with equipping our men and women in uniform, and he has been thinking long and hard about the need to get the next generation of our military the very best capabilities possible. As he has said publicly in speeches and in congressional testimony, he is concerned that our enemies are rapidly expanding and building out their technological innovations for military applications.

But it is important to understand that these countries aren't just building up their own militaries to simply defend themselves; countries such as China and Russia are doing all they can to invest in specific technologies to defeat our forces and to be used for purposes of aggressive activity, whether it is in the South China Sea or in Europe, where Russia continues to threaten the NATO alliance. Countries such as China and Russia are preparing not for next week but for the coming decades to effectively counter and defeat the U.S. militarily. That is a big concern of Secretary Kendall, and it

should be a major concern for all of us here in light of the responsibility of Congress to provide for our military.

I have a chart that helps explain where we are headed. Here we can see the research and development projections for the United States, China, and the European Union. It is not hard to see that China will soon outpace the United States.

This represents total research and development spending for the countries involved—not just in military R&D, but given the fact that a large percentage of research and development is spent on defense-related efforts, on military weaponry, it is a useful bellwether for understanding what the future holds in terms of Chinese and Russian military investment relative to our own. Clearly, we can see that China is on track to overtake the United States in this critical area in the next decade.

I should also point out that, according to one report, this isn't just because China is so committed to research and development; it is also because in recent years, due to austerity measures in our own country, U.S. investment in research and development is increasing at a historically low rate.

Why is this important? Well, it is important because China is using some of this R&D to make weapons that are designed to undermine interests of the United States in the Asia-Pacific region. One recent study made headlines just this week, highlighting that both China and Russia are developing high-speed, high-altitude weapons designed to penetrate traditional U.S. defensive systems, such as our ballistic missile defenses, to attack not only our allies but to potentially attack the mainland of the United States as well.

Reports continue to surface about Chinese cyber theft of top U.S. military and industry secrets. Once they have stolen our trade secrets, the Chinese military can create copycat or cloned weapons for their own use without having to invest the years and billions of dollars that we have to in this country for research and testing and development of those weapons. They can simply steal the blueprints and copy them, saving themselves a lot of money and a lot of time in producing those weapons.

So while nations like China are doing all they can to build their capabilities and research the next cutting-edge weapons, the U.S. military is extremely limited in the amount of money we are investing in our own future, instead having to spend that money to maintain the readiness of current forces. That is where the money has gone—to try to maintain the readiness of our current forces, not looking out to the next 5 and 10 years, to the growing threat of our adversaries having weapon systems that will have the capability not only to be used offensively but potentially to defeat American forces around the world.

We know we need a robust military budget in order to allow us to walk and

chew gum at the same time—to both maintain these world-class forces at high levels of readiness and ensure our troops have the cutting-edge weapons of tomorrow. Back in March, the Committee on Armed Services heard testimony by current Secretary of Defense Ash Carter. At the end of his prepared remarks, Secretary Carter made a point we all need to better understand. He said:

We don't have the luxury of just one opponent, or the choice between the current fight and future fights—we have to do both, and we have to have a budget that supports both.

He went on to explain that means being ready to fight the battles of today and train our current troops but also to develop the technologies and perfect the strategies to fight the wars of the future. And we know from Ronald Reagan's doctrine of peace through strength that military readiness is much more likely to make sure that we don't have to fight those battles because it deters the aggressive actions of our adversaries when America leads and when America is the strongest military in the world. But when our opponents see us pulling back, both in terms of our investment and in terms of American leadership, they are all too happy to fill the void left by that withdrawal.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration has apparently failed to see that national defense is the most critical function the Federal Government performs, and so every time we get into this discussion about how do we spend more money to keep the American people safe and secure, they want to enter into a discussion about how we can raise spending caps so we can spend more money on nondefense discretionary spending, and so it goes.

I believe that defense spending—making sure our men and women in uniform have the training and equipment they need for the current fight but also that we are preparing for the mid- and long-term so they will have the weapons and resources they need to fight the fights of the future—is job No. 1 for us here in the Congress.

It is not too late to eliminate some of these spending caps and to adequately fund the Department of Defense. I look forward to working with all of our colleagues to make sure we take care of job No. 1 before we then look to other priorities in our Federal budget.

We can't take for granted the fact that the U.S. military is the best in the world. We are the best in the world, but there is no certainty or guarantee that will always be the case, especially when our adversaries are making investments for the future and as America's leadership pulls back out of the world and allows others to fill that void. There are other nations at our heels spending a lot of money specifically to neutralize our military advantages and defeat us. The threat extends far beyond China. North Korea, for example, continues to threaten us and our allies with their nuclear weapons

and their missile tests. As I indicated earlier, Russia continues to make tremendous advancements in areas such as cyber and electronic warfare, working to render our most effective and advanced capabilities ineffective.

We don't have any time to waste, and we have to spend more time and more energy looking not just at the threats of today but those of tomorrow and beyond. Frankly, once the threat is upon us, it may be too late to do the sort of research and development and investment we need in order to be prepared.

So I am hopeful that the next Congress, working with the new administration, will be able to move the needle in the right direction. We certainly can't just cross our fingers and hope for the best. That is not fulfilling our responsibilities and doing our duty as Members of the Congress. If we want to maintain our position as the most capable military in the world, we have to continue to act, and act without delay.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

IRAN SANCTIONS EXTENSION BILL

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, the Senate will soon act on a measure, the Iran Sanctions Extension Act, that I have long advocated, and I am proud to be a main cosponsor of this measure. It is a critical step toward deterring and impeding support of Iran's development of conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

I am here to encourage my colleagues to support this 10-year reauthorization of the ISA, as it is known. We must act before it expires, before the end of the year. We really have no practical choice. The practical effect of the Iran nuclear agreement depends on our resolve and on our commitment to reliably and durably stop a nuclear-armed Iran by using sanctions and other means, if necessary. This measure should remove all doubt and dispel all question that we have that resolve and commitment to make sure the Iran nuclear commitment is enforced effectively. It must be enforced effectively not only for our own security but really the entire world's security. That is the reason I have championed efforts to stop a nuclear-armed Iran and make sure this agreement is both verifiable and enforceable.

I have long advocated for this renewal and most recently urged Leader MCCONNELL to prioritize passage of this measure in the waning days of this Congress. I was joined in this effort by Senators STABENOW, MERKLEY, WYDEN, KLOBUCHAR, HEINRICH, and SCHATZ. I thank Senator MCCONNELL for following through on this request and bringing this bill to the floor for a vote today.

This important bipartisan bill has already been approved by the House—in fact, overwhelmingly passed in November—and now the Senate must do the

same. It must leave no question or doubt that we have the resolve and commitment to continue bipartisan support for efforts to block a nuclear-armed Iran.

The ISA is essential to ensuring that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action continues to prevent Iran from realizing its nuclear ambitions. For the United States to maintain its unambiguous ability to immediately snap back sanctions in coming years, the ISA must be renewed—and I hope it will be by a strong and overwhelming bipartisan majority—or we will surrender this critical capability.

Reauthorization is a significant step that will send a strong signal to Iran that our Nation is fully and irrevocably committed to vigorously enforcing the nuclear agreement regardless of the administration and irrespective of the Congress. Future administrations need this ability to snap back existing sanctions—a step necessary for its enforcement, consistent with the agreement and anticipated by it. There is nothing inconsistent in what we do today with the agreement.

This strong message to Iran is that we are ready, willing, and able to hold Iran accountable. We can ill-afford to allow sanctions that deter and impede Iran's development of conventional weapons of mass destruction to expire, as they would expire at the end of the year. My hope is that as many as possible of my Senate colleagues will join in this effort today.

But holding Iran accountable will scarcely end here. We must confront Iran's maligned activities beyond its nuclear program, its continued pursuit of intercontinental missile development, its suppression of free speech and other vital civil liberties in its own country, and, of course, its sponsorship of terrorism around the world. We must fortify the security of our allies in the Middle East, most especially Israel, and our Nation. Our major strategic partner in that region is Israel. I look forward to working with my colleagues on the NDAA, which will provide additional missile defense capabilities to that great ally. And we must see what we do today in renewing the Iran sanctions agreement as part of an overall effort to secure the freedom and democracies that exist in that region insofar as they are always threatened and make sure we protect our Nation from a nuclear-armed Iran.

The Iran sanctions renewal sends a signal and a message, unmistakable to Iran and the world, that we are committed not just to the words of this agreement on paper but to the real enforcement of them and to making sure Iran is held accountable if it violates this agreement in the slightest way.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, on December 1, 2011, the Senate voted 100 to 0 to pass the Menendez-Kirk amendment to impose crippling sanctions on the Central Bank of Iran. As this chart shows, the Menendez-Kirk amendment decreased the value of Iran's currency by 73 percent the following year.

On November 30, 2012, the Senate passed the second Menendez-Kirk amendment by a 94 to 0 vote. This amendment cut off Iran's energy and shipping sectors from international markets. It also restricted Iran's ability to barter in gold and other precious metals. These Iran sanctions played an indispensable role in forcing Iran to the negotiating table, but the administration wasted our powerful economic leverage when it agreed to a bad deal with Iran.

Since this disastrous deal, Iran's behavior has worsened. Iran has taken more American hostages, including Baquer Namazi and Reza Shahini. Iran received over \$100 billion in sanctions relief and has increased support to terrorists groups, such as Hezbollah and Hamas. In fact, Iran announced the creation of its own foreign service to cause problems in Yemen, Iraq, and Iran and those places. Iran has conducted multiple missile tests on October 15, 2015; October 21, 2015; March 8 and 9, 2016; April 19, 2016; and July 11, 2016.

In June of 2015, Senator MENENDEZ and I introduced S. 1682, a bill to renew the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 for 10 more years. I am glad to see the Senate is again taking up a similar bill based on legislation by Congressman ED ROYCE that passed the House by 419 to 1.

I urge my colleagues to support the Iran sanctions bill with overwhelming numbers. President Obama should immediately sign the Iran Sanctions Extension Act into law.

I urge the next President to join with the Congress to do much more. Our children should never be asked to clean up a nuclear war in the Persian Gulf. Iran, which is the biggest sponsor of world terrorism, should not have nuclear weapons.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise to express my support for legislation that the Senate is considering today that will extend the Iran Sanctions Act for 10 years before it expires in just 30 days.

I will be voting for this bill later today, and I am proud to have cosponsored similar legislation earlier this year. The Iran Sanctions Act, or ISA, is an important aspect of U.S. sanctions on Iran.

The ISA was enacted in 1996 to tighten sanctions on Iran in response to its

growing nuclear program and support for terrorist organizations, such as Hamas and Hezbollah. The ISA provides the legislative authority for many of the sanctions on Iran that were lifted but may be reimplemented if Iran violates the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA. These include sanctions on foreign investment in Iran's oil and gas fields, sales of gasoline to Iran, and transportation of Iranian crude oil. Even though these sanctions were suspended by the JCPOA, we need this legal framework to address any Iranian violations of the deal so that sanctions can be rapidly put back in place if necessary.

Additionally, this framework maintains some sanctions that were not lifted under the JCPOA. The ISA still requires the United States to sanction entities that assist Iran with acquiring or developing weapons of mass destruction—that provide “destabilizing numbers and types” of advanced conventional weapons or participate in uranium mining ventures with Iran.

These provisions remain in place, and it is absolutely critical that Congress not allow them to expire at the end of the year.

I believe the Iran Sanctions Act has been effective and must be renewed. Tough sanctions were absolutely critical to bringing Iran to the negotiating table—sanctions such as those in the ISA and the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, which I voted for as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

The JCPOA is the result of these and other tough multilateral sanctions put in place through cooperation with international partners, but it is essential that the deal is strictly enforced.

Earlier this year, I led a letter to President Obama, along with 14 of my colleagues, to express our concern about the lack of technical details published by the International Atomic Energy Agency, or IAEA, in reports on Iran's compliance with the JCPOA.

While the IAEA is the watchdog responsible for monitoring Iran's compliance with the JCPOA, it is up to the United States and other parties of the JCPOA to respond to any violations.

To ensure strict compliance, the IAEA should also publish technical details, including the total quantity of low-enriched uranium in Iran and the amount produced in Natanz, specifics on Iran's centrifuge research and development, and progress made on converting Iran's nuclear facilities. These details will provide independent experts and Members of Congress conducting oversight of the JCPOA the opportunity to renew the data behind the IAEA's analysis.

Iran opposes what we are doing here today, and they will say that renewing the Iran Sanctions Act is a violation of the JCPOA. Well, let me say, that is simply not true. Reauthorization of the Iran Sanctions Act in no way violates the JCPOA. The Iran Sanctions Act has

been the law of the land since 1996. It was in place when the JCPOA was adopted, and it remains in effect today.

With our vote today, Congress will make clear that the United States will not hesitate to maintain sanctions on Iran and those that seek to provide the world's largest State sponsor of terrorism with weapons of mass destruction. We stand ready to impose rapid and strict punishments for any violation of the JCPOA. This sanctions regime is how we hold Iran accountable, strengthen our security, and deter Iranian hostility towards our allies, especially the State of Israel, which Iran has singled out as a target for destruction.

Diplomacy is always our preferred course of action, but it does not work in a vacuum. It only works if it is backed up with credible deterrence.

Today we show that the United States will continue our leadership against Iranian aggression—work that must continue in the years ahead.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, continued implementation of the Iran nuclear agreement, known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, JCPOA, is our best shot at stopping Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. And so far at least, that agreement has been working.

The Iranians are fulfilling their JCPOA commitments. And so we must also maintain our commitment both to the letter and to the spirit of this historic agreement. Assuming Iran continues to comply, the agreement can and should last for many years. I know many have noted President-Elect Trump's negative comments about renegotiating its terms or even scrapping it outright. I suspect—at least I hope—that once he learns more about the actual national security consequences of scrapping the agreement—of which we were all reminded yesterday by CIA Director John Brennan—he may reconsider.

We know Iran is a state sponsor of terrorism, that it destabilizes the region and violates the human rights of its people. That is why Western policymakers agreed to separate out and try to secure agreement on this one discrete issue. They knew an Iran with a nuclear weapon would be especially dangerous—to us, to Israel, and to the region.

In fact, it is important to keep in mind that this whole process began in the Bush administration, with a Republican President who was—in the wake of the Iraq War—willing to engage Iran diplomatically. The Bush administration laid the foundation for what eventually became the Iran Nuclear Agreement—sanctions relief in return for strict limits on Iran's nuclear program.

In June 2008, President Bush's National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice signed a memorandum with the P5+1, which said that, in return for Iran doing key things to limit its nu-

clear program, the U.S. was ready to recognize Iran's right to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes; treat Iran's nuclear program like any nonnuclear weapons state party to the nonproliferation treaty, if international confidence in the peaceful nature of its program could be restored; provide technical and financial aid for peaceful nuclear energy; and work with Iran on confidence-building measures, begin to normalize trade and economic relations, and allow for civil aviation cooperation.

All of this should sound familiar because it was effectively the early outline of the Iran Nuclear Agreement.

As you know, the scope of the sanctions relief provided to Iran under the JCPOA is explicitly limited to nuclear-related sanctions. The United States continues to enforce vigorously a variety of nonnuclear sanctions against Iran, including for ballistic missile violations, human rights abuses, and acts of state-supported terrorism. Our primary trade embargo against Iran remains largely intact. Thus, our ability to maintain sanctions pressure on Iran has been preserved, even as we secured an agreement to prevent a state sponsor of terrorism from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Today we are debating a simple 10-year extension of the Iran Sanctions Act. Strictly speaking, extension of the act is not legally necessary to continue to enforce our existing sanctions against Iran. As administration officials have testified before the Banking Committee and elsewhere, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and other authorities provide all of the tools that we would need in order to keep the pressure on Iran—or even to ratchet up the pressure incrementally, if warranted.

But I believe that extending it today is important for two reasons. First, it is a signal of our resolve to keep the heat on Iran and its leaders and to ensure that, if they stray from the agreement through any significant violations, together with our partners in Europe, we would respond forcefully—including if necessary by immediately snapback sanctions on Iran. And second, today's action will make even clearer that we will continue to enforce the nonnuclear sanctions on Iran related to terrorism and ballistic missiles and human rights violations.

As we consider extension of the Iran Sanctions Act today, I hope that we will keep in mind what is truly necessary in order to maintain our current sanctions architecture. The JCPOA was a groundbreaking agreement designed to prevent Iran from obtaining a weapon of mass destruction—but it is also a relatively new and somewhat fragile agreement. We should be very careful, going forward, not to violate the terms of the JCPOA by simply imposing under another guise the old sanctions that were waived or suspended under the nuclear agreement. If that were to happen, our success in

preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon could be unwound in a matter of weeks—or even days. And then we would be isolated internationally, instead of Iran being isolated as the outlier by the international community, as it was under the JCPOA.

Our debate today sends an important signal to Iran: We resolve to continue our fight against terrorism worldwide, to counter Iran's moves to further destabilize the Middle East region, and to impose consequences for the grave human rights abuses that, sadly, continue in Iran to this day. Of course, in addition to renewing these sanctions and maintaining tough JCPOA oversight, Congress must also continue to support robust military and other aid to regional partners like Israel. We should focus both on ensuring strict implementation of the agreement and on the most effective ways to pressure Iran's leaders to change their destabilizing behaviors in the region.

There is no question of our willingness to maintain our current Iran sanctions architecture. We can and we will continue to vigorously enforce nonnuclear sanctions against Iran. And I believe we presently have all of the tools we need to do so. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. PETERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

21ST CENTURY CURES BILL

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I come today to the Senate floor to offer congratulations to the U.S. House of Representatives because last night, in an overwhelming vote, they passed what Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL has described as the single most important piece of legislation the Congress is likely to enact this year.

I am referring to the 21st Century Cures Act, combined with the mental health bill, which is the most significant set of reforms of major mental health programs in 10 years. The Cures package is the result of bipartisan work over the last 2 years. Its purpose is to move cures and treatments through the expensive development process and the extensive regulatory process and into the medicine cabinets and doctors' offices of America more rapidly and safely at the same time. That also helps to lower costs, and we hear a great deal of talk about the affordability of prescription medicines. If it takes more than 10 or 15 years and more than \$1 billion to develop a drug, such as a treatment for Alzheimer's, that all adds to the final cost. We would like to lower that cost and speed that time up as long as we continue to do it safely.

I wish to especially compliment the chairman of the House committee that worked on this, Chairman FRED UPTON, as well as Congressman PALLONE and Congresswoman DEGETTE, Democratic Members of the House of Representatives. They have worked with Senator MURRAY, the ranking Democrat on the Senate's HELP Committee, and with me for the last 2 years on a very complex but very important bill.

Part of the bill has to do with money, and one part of that is \$1 billion of funding for State grants for opioids. Now, I suspect one reason there was such a large vote in the House of Representatives yesterday—only 26 Members voted no and 392 voted yes—was because of this \$1 billion for opioids. At least in Tennessee—and I am sure it is true in most States of the country—there is no more urgent epidemic than opioid misuse. It is filling up the courts. It is filling up the jails. It is filling up the hospitals. It is causing tragedies in families all across America.

The Senate passed important legislation earlier this year on programs authorizing new money, but this is the money for State grants to Iowa, to Tennessee, to California, and to every State to help deal with the opioid epidemic abuse. So I suspect that one reason so many Members of the House voted yes yesterday and so few voted no would be that it would be pretty hard to explain a “no” vote against \$1 billion of State grants for opioid abuse.

There is also \$4.8 billion of funding for the National Institutes of Health, which Francis Collins, the distinguished Director, calls the “national institutes of hope.” and there is \$1.8 billion for the Cancer Moonshot led by Vice President BIDEN. There is \$1.4 for the Precision Medicine Initiative, or personalized medicine initiative, a special project of President Obama, and \$1.6 billion is for the BRAIN Initiative. There are remarkable advances being made in the ability to identify Alzheimer's before symptoms are evident and then to slow its progression. It is hard to imagine how much grief that would end and the billions it would save if we could do that. So those are other reasons why there are only 26 Members of the House of Representatives who voted no yesterday and 392 who voted yes.

The Mayo Clinic has sent a letter to me:

On behalf of the Mayo Clinic, I write in enthusiastic support of the 21st Century Cures Act and salute your strong, bipartisan leadership on this essential legislation.

We are pleased to see the inclusion of dedicated streaming funds for the Food and Drug Administration and National Institutes of Health. . . .

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

So next Monday the Senate will have a chance to see whether we can do as well as the House of Representatives. I ask my colleagues to think long and

hard about a big vote. We need a big vote. Let me give my colleagues one reason especially why. This \$6.3 billion that is in the 21st Century Cures bill is designated for opioids, for precision medicine, for cancer, for brain, and for FDA, and it has to be approved every year by a vote. That is the way our appropriations process works. I would say to my Democratic friends as well as to my Republican friends that if you are concerned about whether the \$6.3 billion will be available next year and the next year, the best way to ensure that it is will be to cast a big vote on Monday for it this year, because it will be very hard to explain, if you vote for \$6.3 billion this year spread over the next few years, why you did not vote to support it next year and the following year.

The big vote in the House should give assurance to Democrats as well as Republicans in the Senate that these are real dollars, that they are provided in a fundamentally responsible way. To Republicans who look at the \$6.3 billion and say: I like the idea of funding opioids; I like the idea of improving funding for the National Institutes of Health, let me say that this is done in a responsible way.

Speaker RYAN, who everybody knows is a conservative budget hawk, created the mechanism for this funding. It was approved by TOM PRICE, the House Budget Committee chairman. It goes like this: \$6.3 billion over the next several years for these dedicated purposes. It can only be spent for those purposes. It has to be approved every year. It does not increase the overall spending of the budget by one penny because it is offset by reductions in mandatory spending on the other side. So \$6.3 billion up here and \$6.3 billion down there over the next 10 years.

So this is a compromise, but it is a magnificent compromise. It is, as Senator MCCONNELL has said, the most important piece of legislation we will deal with this year. The House passed it with a huge bipartisan vote: 392 to 26. I hope that we in the Senate do just as well next Monday because the real winners will be the American people as they look forward to treatments for Alzheimer's, for cancer, a vaccine for Zika, a non-addictive pain medicine that will help deal with the opioid misuse epidemic, and regenerative medicine, which may help restore hearts and perhaps even eyesight in miraculous ways.

This is truly an exciting time, and this is truly an effective piece of legislation that deserves our support by coming to the floor on Monday and then by passing it on Tuesday or Wednesday.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYO CLINIC,

Rochester, MN, November 30, 2016.

Sen. LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR ALEXANDER: On behalf of Mayo Clinic, I write in enthusiastic support

of the 21st Century Cures Act and salute your strong, bipartisan leadership on this essential legislation.

Efforts to advance biomedical innovation and accelerate the development and delivery of cures are of great importance to Mayo Clinic and our patients. We are pleased to see the inclusion of dedicated funding streams for the Food and Drug Administration and National Institutes of Health—including funds for research efforts such as the President's Precision Medicine initiative, the Vice President's Cancer Moonshot, and the BRAIN initiative to speed diagnosis and treatment of conditions such as Alzheimer's disease.

In addition, provisions to promote administrative streamlining, telehealth efforts and mental health reform are also of critical importance in allowing Mayo Clinic physicians and researchers to provide the best possible care to patients.

Mayo Clinic is grateful for your leadership, wholeheartedly supports this comprehensive legislation and looks forward to this innovative effort being signed into law, and we pledge to be a committed partner in its implementation. Thank you.

With best regards,

JOHN H. NOSEWORTHY, M.D.,

President & CEO.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Madam President, today marks the 54th version of “Waste of the Week”—54 times I have been down here in the Senate to highlight documented examples of waste, fraud, and abuse. When I first started this endeavor, I told my staff: I hope we can reach \$100 billion or so—some target. Do you think there is that much waste, fraud, and abuse floating around through the Federal Government?

Well, we hit that \$100 billion a long time ago—I think about the 20th week—and we now have moved to a pretty staggering number, which is more than one-third of a trillion dollars of waste that has been documented by independent agencies of the government that are supporting us with information as to why this money should not have been spent or how it was wasted or lost through fraud or abuse.

I have had a number of serious issues here that run into the billions of dollars that could easily be fixed. Some of them we started by pointing this out with legislation to try to fix these things, but it just keeps piling on here. So every once in a while, I throw in something so ridiculous, people will understand the fact that there may have been some benefit to that program—we don't understand what the benefit was—but surely these ridiculous examples of money spent, hard-

earned tax money spent, are not used for this purpose. Tell me it is not true. Unfortunately, it is true. So today I am adding two more examples of something where people say: How can this be possible? The total ends up at about another \$1.5 million.

One of the studies funded by grants from the National Science Foundation totaled \$1.3 million. The researcher's application stated they would use the grant funds to examine a variety of factors, one of which was, how does humidity affect the heat that we feel? So, you know, if you go to Florida and it is 90 degrees, you have to shower three times a day. You are sweating, and it feels like it is 110, but the temperature says 90. If you go to Arizona and it is 90 degrees, you don't have to take a shower at all because you can go out and take a run, and it is so dry, you don't feel that heat you would feel in Florida.

I have the same situation in Indiana. Northern Indiana is up near the Great Lakes. It is much cooler and has lower humidity than Southern Indiana, which lies down along the Ohio River. So it can be the same temperature down in southern Indiana as northern Indiana, but people really feel that it is different.

I think we all know this. We have all experienced this through summers, through dry days and through humid days. But, no, the National Science Foundation said: We need a study. Let's give a grant for someone who has made an application—\$1.3 million—to see if we can prove that humidity makes it feel as though it is a lot hotter.

So that is what they did. Folks, I can't make this up. This is true. In their initial study, they took beer cans and koozies. Do you know what koozies are? Koozies are those things that you wrap around a cold bottle of Coca Cola or a cold bottle of beer or a can of this or that in order to keep it cold. They put these beer cans in koozies to see if that would be successful in moderating the humidity or what it would do to it.

The researcher's initial round of testing was done in a basement bathroom, where researchers adjusted the temperature and humidity by turning on a hot-water shower and a space heater.

Now, you think, OK, NSF gave us \$1.3 million to try to put a study together. You would think they would go to some kind of lab and get sophisticated equipment and so forth. Instead, they went down into the basement bathroom, shut the door, and turned on the shower, hot water. That wasn't enough, so they put a space heater in there to heat it up. Guess what. The koozies worked.

Well, when you go buy a product this winter at Christmastime, everybody is going to go out and buy stuff. Companies will test something that they want to sell, that they think is going to be bought by the American people. They are successful. Do we have to provide a government grant to help deter-

mine whether this works? Can't we just go to the company and say: Hey, you developed this. What were your studies? What did you learn?

Anyway, that was \$1.3 million. I think we have a photo. Here it is. Here, essentially, is what \$1.3 million bought. They got a little something to measure with, and they put a can over this—looks like Gatorade or some kind of Powerade or whatever. I suppose the money went to buy some of this equipment here to test that. But does the taxpayer have to do this? Is \$1.38 million of money taken from taxpayers' paychecks—is that what it is used for? Well, I guess this is great news for beverage drinkers, but it is mind-boggling that we spend that kind of money.

The second thing I would highlight here is another study, this one by DARPA. DARPA is the Federal Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. For over 50 years—and I admire this Agency—it has done a lot of good things. This little-known Agency states that it is held to a singular and enduring mission that is on their literature: to make pivotal investments in breakthrough technologies for national security purposes. That is a needed, essential use of Federal dollars, to make sure that our warfighters have the kind of equipment and have the kind of research backing up what they are doing. So that is a legitimate expenditure. But why did DARPA decide that understanding why coffee sometimes spills when you are walking is a matter of national security? Now, maybe if the coffee is hot and it gets on the soldier's hands or whatever—the Presiding Officer has had military experience. I am not sure that, as someone in command, you would authorize a study to see that if you were moving when you had a cup of coffee in your hand, you were more likely to spill the coffee than if you were standing still. Trust me, folks—that is what this study was all about. Here was the conclusion of the study: To prevent a spill, you need to pay attention to your coffee while you are walking because the movement might result in a spill.

Now, a confession here. On my way to work—I drive in from Virginia. I have to go by a bakery shop on Lee Highway. I slip in there every morning—it has now become a habit; I have gotten to know the people—for a donut and a cup of coffee. But I don't want to waste time trying to get to work, so I jump into the car and eat the donut and drink the coffee while I am trying to deal with traffic in Washington and get over the bridges and get to work. I have noticed over time that if I have to put the brakes on a little hard or start a little fast or make a quick turn, my coffee spills out of the cup. So all they would have had to do was to buy my coffee, and I could have proved to them that movement would require liquid to move also, and if they are worried about coffee spilling out of the cup, I could have proved that, and all they had to do was buy me a donut and a cup of coffee.

Where does all of this come down? Where this all comes down is the fact that we are nearly \$20 trillion in debt. We cannot balance our budget. We spend more every year than we take in. We have to go out and borrow that money, on which we then have to pay interest. By the way, interest rates are going up. When we are in this kind of a fiscal situation, can we not at least, as a body, stop this waste, fraud, and abuse and these stupid expenditures and ridiculous expenditures of taxpayer money?

This here is just a drop in the bucket. We have much bigger things to do to save taxpayers' dollars. But at the very least, could we not address the waste, abuse, and fraud that is taking place? I have offered legislation on a number of ways to do that.

I know the majority leader is moving to the floor here and I need to wrap up, so I will. At the end of 54 times down here on the Senate floor, we have a total of \$351,587,239,536 of documented, certified waste, fraud, and abuse. We wonder why the American people are fed up with the status quo of what is happening here in Washington.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

TSUNAMI WARNING, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the body the message to accompany H.R. 34.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 34) entitled "An Act to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes", with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 34.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 34, an act to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, Bob Corker, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts,

Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Lindsey Graham, Lamar Alexander, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, Michael B. Enzi, John Barrasso, Shelley Moore Capito, John McCain, Bill Cassidy.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 5117

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 34, with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 34 with an amendment numbered 5117.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5118 TO AMENDMENT NO. 5117

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 5118 to amendment No. 5117.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 5119

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to refer the House message on H.R. 34 to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with instructions to report back forthwith an amendment numbered 5119.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer the House message on H.R. 34 to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 5119.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5120

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 5120 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 34.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5121 TO AMENDMENT NO. 5120

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 5121 to amendment No. 5120.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “4” and insert “5”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the motion to concur occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, December 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

IRAN SANCTIONS EXTENSION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6297, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6297) to reauthorize the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam 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.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 155 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Alexander	Fischer	Murphy
Ayotte	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Gillibrand	Perdue
Blumenthal	Graham	Peters
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Reid
Boxer	Heitkamp	Risch
Brown	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Hoeben	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johnson	Schumer
Casey	Kaine	Scott
Cassidy	King	Sessions
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Sullivan
Corker	Lee	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McCaskill	Udall
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Enzi	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Sanders

The bill (H.R. 6297) was passed.

TSUNAMI WARNING, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the vacancy of the U.S. Supreme Court.

We have been on this issue and what needs to happen next year when our next President is sworn in. For months this year, I and other Members of this body held our ground in saying that the American people deserve a voice in this process. We talked about how the integrity of the advice and consent process, clearly outlined in article II, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, was at stake. We outlined years of precedent against nominating and confirming a Supreme Court Justice during a Presidential election cycle.

The last time a vacancy arose and a nominee was confirmed in a Presidential election year was 1932, and 1888 was the last Presidential election year in which a Justice was nominated and confirmed by a divided government. Confirming a nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court should never be distorted by political theater of a Presidential election cycle. This is a bipartisan position. Both parties have said at different times in the past decade or so what I and many colleagues on this floor have said just this year.

Since day one, I have consistently said that no Supreme Court nominee

should be considered for the Supreme Court or considered by the Senate before the next President is sworn in. That also meant no consideration during the lameduck, either, no matter the outcome of the election. You can't have it both ways. This was my position before the election. This is still my position today. It was and is about the principle, not the individual. As an outsider to the political process, this was a logical and an easy position to take from the very beginning. The process for nominating and confirming a Justice to the U.S. Supreme Court is enshrined in our Constitution.

The hyperpartisanship and politics of a Presidential election cycle should have absolutely no place in this process. Confirming any individual to a lifetime appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court must rise from that kind of political posturing. It must be above any political theater.

Furthermore, as I said previously, the American people deserved a voice in this process. Election day was not only about changing the direction of our country, but it was also a referendum on the ballots of the Supreme Court for generations to come.

Our decision to withhold consent on any Supreme Court nominee, until after a new President is sworn in, protected the integrity of the advice-and-consent process from political games in a heated Presidential campaign cycle. That decision was entirely within the rights and responsibilities of the Senate, as outlined in the Constitution.

We did our job, and next year we are going to continue to do that job of advice and consent as we consider the next nomination for the Supreme Court. With a new President sworn in, it will be time for the Senate to confirm a nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court. The election is over. The people have spoken. Americans have elected a new President. They chose a new direction.

I urge Members of this body to listen to them, and I urge this body to remember the integrity of the process. I also look forward to learning from whomever President-Elect Trump nominates to serve on the Supreme Court and having the opportunity to vote on his or her confirmation.

I yield my time.

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. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, since my arrival in the U.S. Senate a few years ago, I have been a proponent and advocate and have attempted to champion an issue many in the Senate care about; that is, the desire to increase America's investment in medical research, increase the likelihood of out-

comes that are desirable in improving every American's well-being, and end the pain and heartache that comes with diagnoses that often end in difficult lives and ultimately death. We have worked hard as a Senate on this issue.

I serve on the Appropriations Committee with the Presiding Officer. I serve on the appropriations subcommittee that funds the National Institutes of Health, and from my vantage point, it is clear to me that we have made a significant investment in increasing the amount of dollars that taxpayers pay to try to find those cures for cancer, eliminate the onset of Alzheimer's, help with diabetes and mental health issues.

Leadership has been busy for a number of months, and that hard work will culminate with a vote next week on the 21st Century Cures Act. It is an important component of this medical innovation I find so necessary for the benefit of Kansans, Americans, and for people who live around the globe.

This Cures Act invests in the future of our country by providing a significant increase in Federal support for lifesaving biomedical research that will simply impact the life of every American—certainly every American family. These important investments range from increasing the funding at the National Institutes of Health, advancing the precision medicine initiative, funding important cancer research through the cancer Moonshot, and supporting the BRAIN Initiative to improve our understanding of diseases like Alzheimer's.

There are also provisions that will accelerate the FDA approval and drug development process as well as fight opioid abuse and suicides.

The subcommittee the Presiding Officer and I serve on in the Appropriations Committee, or the subcommittee that deals with agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration, wants to give the FDA the tools necessary to accelerate the process by which lifesaving drugs and devices are available for Americans and citizens around the globe.

Under the 21st Century Cures Act, the National Institutes of Health will receive a significant dollar investment increase over the next 10 years. We know that will drive research forward to develop a greater understanding of rare diseases. We often think about NIH as dealing with those major afflictions—cancer and Alzheimer's and diabetes—but many Americans unfortunately suffer from rare diseases, and we want to help find the treatments that are patient-centric that treat rare diseases as well.

This funding will send a message that we acknowledge the benefits of NIH research in a strong bipartisan way. This funding will also work in tandem with those increases that we have provided at NIH through the normal annual appropriations process.

We have always given NIH the ability to prioritize their research that could

result in the biggest bang for the buck, the most lifesaving opportunities, but obviously the more resources NIH has, the more opportunities they have to find those cures and advancements in treatments.

This effort also supports the best and brightest among us—those researchers and scientists. I want young Kansans to have a future, if they are interested in science and mathematics and engineering and research, and an opportunity to pursue those careers, hopefully in our State, but certainly in this country. We want the United States to continue to be at the forefront of medical research and within the realm of science and engineering as well. This is an economic engine for our Nation. It can be and is an economic engine for my State. The Cures Act accelerates those opportunities for young people and others across the country who want to devote their lives toward a noble cause of making life longer, greater longevity, but also with fewer challenges and afflictions that come to many people who encounter disease.

The burdens of diseases like Alzheimer's, cancer, stroke, and mental illness can be lessened through research. A long time ago, well before the Affordable Care Act and ObamaCare, I sat down and put my thoughts on paper as to what we should do to try to reduce the cost of health care in this country. What can we do to reduce the price people have to pay to be insured? That list is long. In my view, the way to do this is incremental, but one of those increments is to invest in medical research. The amount of money that we can save if we can find the cure for cancer, if we can find the delay for the onset of Alzheimer's, is certainly in the billions of dollars, and the investment in medical research helps us to save health care dollars, therefore helping us to make health insurance more affordable for all Americans. It certainly is an investment in economics, it is an investment in the ability to save money, as well as what we know about saving lives and making treatments available to people who otherwise would have less life enjoyment as a result of disease.

New scientific findings are what yields breakthroughs that enable us to confront the staggering challenges of disease and illness, and we can do that through the Cures Act and the efforts we have made over the last several years to make certain that NIH has additional resources.

When it comes to cancer, half of all men and a third of all women in the United States will develop cancer in their lifetime. This bill includes the Cancer Moonshot provision for \$1.8 billion of funding. It seeks to combat those statistics to reduce the chances that somebody encounters cancer in their lives and to reduce the costs associated with it. This research will focus on accelerating cancer research and make more therapies more available to

more people, to a wider range of patients, and improve our ability to detect cancers at earlier stages of its development and, hopefully, prevent that disease altogether.

So cancer is front and center with the Moonshot and the Cures Act.

For the Food and Drug Administration, an agency that I have learned more about in the last couple of years and have taken a greater interest in, we need to have reforms that are included in the Cures Act that target speeding up the FDA's approval of new medicines and medical equipment.

Pharmaceuticals have become a significant portion of how we treat disease. It used to be in the early days of my life, and certainly in my parents' lives, that you went to the doctor and you were examined and you may be admitted to the hospital. So often today you are examined, and you are given a prescription. It is a way now that we treat patients. We have today a wider variety of opportunities that pharmaceuticals provide, and we need to make certain that the FDA has the resources, has the right mentality, the mindset—is not a bureaucratic organization—that can advance the production of new drugs available to treat Americans with a wide array of options. This legislation brings a patient-focused view to drug development that will be so relevant in the process of bringing forward the things we need to cure and treat Americans.

Opioids have been a topic of conversation of this Senate for a number of months—for the last several years, in fact—and, unfortunately, millions across the country struggle with an addiction to opioids. It is a heartbreaking reality. The Presiding Officer and I come from rural States. We wish we could say that our States are immune, that it is a problem for folks in the cities or suburbs or someplace else. But, unfortunately, opioids and other drug addictions are a significant component of the challenges we face at home. We include in the Cures bill additional dollars to address the addiction issue, including prevention and treatment, prescription drug monitoring programs, and efforts to reform our current system.

It is important that this legislation pass as a followup to the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, which I voted for earlier this year, to try to stop the spread of opioid abuse in communities across the country.

I have started paying more attention to mental health issues at home as well, visiting our community mental health centers, visiting our State and mental health hospitals. We need to make certain that in our efforts to focus on health care, we have an appropriate prioritization of mental health as well. The 21st Century Cures Act takes steps forward in that regard in providing solutions for more than 11.5 million American adults who live with mental illness that is considered disabling. Important sections of the Help-

ing Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, which represents some of the most significant reforms to the mental health system in more than a decade, are included in the Cures Act. These efforts are aided by establishing a new Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Abuse at the Department of Health and Human Services, and we are hopeful that this person will help us coordinate direct funding and remove the regulatory barriers that hold back our abilities to find treatment and cures and care for people who suffer from mental illness.

Suicides are a significant problem. The Presiding Officer and I serve on the Veterans' Committee together, where suicides by veterans are an ever-present problem. Twenty-two veterans a day commit suicide. Our efforts at focusing research and treatment in regard to mental health can help save the lives of those who sacrificed so much for us and comfort their families and avoid disasters and tragedies that occur way too often.

There are a couple of provisions that were included in this legislation as it works its way through the Senate. I am supportive of many of those related to rural health care. For my time in Congress, I have been an active member of the rural health care caucus. I represent a State that has 127 hospitals in communities across our State. Those hospitals provide health care and jobs for people in rural America. Rural Kansans have paid into FICA and Social Security taxes and deserve to have the attention they need for treating individuals who choose to live in rural America, in keeping those hospital doors open, keeping physicians in our communities, and keeping the pharmacy open on Main Street. Those are things that matter greatly to me.

Unfortunately, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, a component of the Department of Health and Human Services, often creates rules and regulations that make no sense in the places that the Presiding Officer and I come from. So I am supporting a couple of things in particular that are included in this bill. We had a regulation that came from CMS—the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services—generally called physician supervision. Its enforcement is delayed 1 year in the Cures Act. I am the sponsor of legislation to rid us of that regulation permanently, but it is a benefit for us to have it out of the system for another year as we work to find that permanent solution. But the idea that there must be a physician present in certain circumstances—it is difficult for us to have a physician on site in a room with a patient in every circumstance, and our mid-levels and others are important to us in rural communities in particular. That delay is something we have worked hard on, and I am pleased to see that we were successful in getting it included in this legislation.

Many of those hospitals that I mentioned in Kansas—127 hospitals in our

State, 80-plus—90 or so—are what are called critical access hospitals, which is a special designation that allows them a so-called cost-based reimbursement. When I was in the House of Representatives, I authored legislation that created an opportunity to expand the critical access hospital designation to hospitals that are slightly larger and that wouldn't otherwise meet the criteria, which is 25 beds or less. There is a demonstration project, a pilot program that has been operating in the country for the last 5 years, trying to determine what cost-based reimbursement would mean for hospitals that are slightly larger than 25 beds. That demonstration project is expiring. Fortunately, language in the Cures Act extends that community health demonstration project—something, again, we have worked hard to make certain happens. I am pleased that the lead sponsors of this legislation were amenable to our request to include these provisions.

I would conclude by saying the United States has a responsibility to continue our leadership in providing medical breakthroughs that will help change the world, and certainly change people's lives, to develop those cures and treat diseases, and we must commit ourselves to significant support for research that is supported in legislation just like the 21st Century Cures Act. This legislation has the capacity to benefit millions of Americans suffering from chronic diseases. It can help our grandparents, our children, our lifelong best friends, and we can avoid the tragedy that comes with a diagnosis that often ends in death. People's lives depend upon the decisions we make, and this is a decision we can make that will benefit many Americans and their families.

Our researchers must be able to rely on consistent, sustainable funding support from Congress; otherwise we will lose the best and brightest, and we will lose men and women who think maybe they want to be a researcher and find a cure for a disease, but because of their uncertainty as to whether or not their research might get funded or whether the funding is going to be there next year—they get it, but they are uncertain as to whether it will continue. We don't want to lose those bright minds and noble colleagues, people across our country who might enter into the profession of medical research to help find ways to meet the needs of Americans and their health care.

NIH-supported research has raised life expectancy, improved the quality of life, and lowered overall health care costs. This legislation strengthens that circumstance and allows us to better remain globally competitive in the arena of medical research. The 21st Century Cures Act is a powerful statement by Congress, but, more important than being a statement, it is something that will actually make a difference in the future of the people that we care about.

I commend the efforts by many Senators and Members of the House to make certain that this legislation arrives here in the Senate before there is a recess for the holidays. It will be a strong statement, but, more importantly, we expect significant results and the improvement of people's lives across the Nation and around the globe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANTI-SEMITISM AWARENESS ACT OF 2016

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 10, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 10) to provide for the consideration of a definition of anti-Semitism for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today, along with my colleague from South Carolina, to talk about a bill we have introduced entitled the "Anti-Semitism Awareness Act of 2016."

Let me say first that I wish we were living in a time where we would not have to introduce legislation like this, but unfortunately what we have seen over a long period of time—and I think a problem that is getting worse—is the rising tide of anti-Semitism in substantial sectors of our society. We have, in fact, a rise in the incidence of religious discrimination and religiously motivated hate crimes. To say that is unacceptable, even un-American, is an understatement.

We have to take action at long last to do what we can in the U.S. Senate, and I hope in the House as well, to not just speak out against anti-Semitism but to take action which will lead to a better strategy to deal with it. What do I mean by that? Well, it is simple. It is about definitions, and it is about making sure that Federal agencies, such as the Department of Education, do their job when it comes to combating anti-Semitism. We know that one piece of legislation is not somehow going to magically eradicate anti-Semitism. We don't have that naive hope. But what we do believe is that if we don't take action, this problem is only going to get worse.

Some of the problem, frankly, is on our college campuses, and I know that

is true, unfortunately and regrettably, in my home State of Pennsylvania. We don't have time to list every incident, every action, every terrible example of this, but I will just provide one for the record.

In September, students at Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania—one of our great institutions of higher education not only in Pennsylvania but across the country—Swarthmore is a great school, but here is what they found. They found swastikas spray-painted in a bathroom in the library. The college leadership did the right thing in swiftly condemning these actions and removing the graffiti, and I am glad they did that.

I can only try to imagine—and I can literally only try to understand because I have never been the victim of this kind of hate—the horror that was experienced by those students and their families. A person comes to a college or a university as a place where they are going to learn and grow and live in a community, and then there are people—for whatever reason, and I will never understand the reason anyone would do that—painting those images and using language and taking other actions that discriminate against people because of who they are. We have to be not just concerned about this, as I said, but we have to figure out a way to take action.

This particular piece of legislation is aimed at a terrible manifestation of this problem. When anti-Semitic views lead to discrimination against students of Jewish faith or Jewish ancestry, that is the result, and they are the victims of this. The intent here is simple and narrowly circumscribed to make sure we are getting at the problem as best we can to define anti-Semitism at long last—this hasn't been done before—to define anti-Semitism so that the Department of Education can effectively investigate allegations of discrimination motivated by anti-Semitism under the Civil Rights Act. The bill does not infringe on the First Amendment. It does not infringe on those rights of free speech. It is intended to help protect students from discrimination on the basis of their faith.

We all agree that religious discrimination has no place on campuses, has no place in our society, and we have to do more than just speak out against it. That is fundamental, but we can do more than just speak out; we can define it and thereby give in this case one Federal Government agency one tool it needs to deal with this issue. This is a bill which is timely not only because of what is happening on college campuses but unfortunately what has happened in too many parts of our society. We want to make sure the Department of Education has at least one of those tools to deal with this problem.

Because of the nature of this problem, we have people on both sides of the aisle here who are very concerned about it. I am particularly grateful

that I am joined by my colleague from South Carolina, Senator SCOTT, who is joining with me. We are a Democrat and a Republican from different parts of the country and a different point of view on a lot of issues. On this issue we are unified, and we have a solidarity about not just the problem, but there is a solidarity and a consensus about one of the things we can do to take action on this issue.

I am grateful to be joined by my colleague from South Carolina.

I yield the floor to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator CASEY for joining me on the floor.

There is no question that much of our country yearns for a day when Republicans and Democrats come together on issues that impact who we are as a nation. I am thankful that Senator CASEY has joined me in this objective of making sure hate is pushed out of this Nation every single day.

Today I come to speak about an alarming issue—the issue of hate. It truly tears at the very fabric of our great Nation and should inspire all of us to stand up and be counted on the side of justice, on the side of common sense, and on the side of making sure this great American family remains one Nation.

Over the past several years, there has been a sharp rise in religiously motivated hate crimes, particularly on our college and university campuses all over America. According to the FBI, close to 60 percent of these crimes were due to anti-Jewish sentiments. From 2014 to 2015, we saw the number of reported incidents double. Let me say that one more time. In a year, we saw a doubling of the incidence of religious discrimination on college campuses, and the vast majority of those issues and situations focused on the Jewish community. There were 90 anti-Jewish incidents reported at 60 schools last year, compared with 47 incidents on 43 campuses just the year before. These numbers are staggering.

Senator CASEY noted that there have been college campuses and buildings on college campuses where we have seen swastikas. We have heard protests that call for Zionists to leave the school, and we have heard references being made to burning in Auschwitz. I am stunned and saddened by the careless and hateful reminders of such an incredibly dark and daunting time in our world's history, but I also feel empowered and committed to taking a stand against hate. No one, not a single person should ever have to experience being singled out because of who they are or attacked based on the religion they choose to follow. There is simply no place in our country for this kind of intolerance, especially not in our country, the greatest country on Earth.

As citizens of this great Nation, it falls on us to stand up and do more to protect our students from being targeted by any form of hate and bigotry.

It is important that we work together to stamp out anti-Semitism and other forms of religious discrimination. Our students should be able to go to school, to grow, to learn, and to develop without having to worry about being discriminated against. Although the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights has stated that they will not tolerate incidents such as these, there exists a lack of firm guidance on what constitutes anti-Semitic acts. That is why Senator CASEY and I stand before you today to introduce the bipartisan Anti-Semitism Awareness Act. We have come together to ensure that the U.S. Department of Education has the necessary tools at their disposal to investigate anti-Jewish discrimination.

Our proposed legislation uses the very definition of anti-Semitism adopted by the U.S. State Department's Special Envoy to monitor and combat anti-Semitism. This important clarification will provide necessary direction to assist officials and administrators to understand when anti-Semitic activities are occurring. By clarifying exactly what anti-Semitism is, we will leave no question as to what constitutes an illegal anti-Semitic incident.

As we seek to tackle this concerning issue, it is important to note that this act will in no way infringe on any individual right protected under the First Amendment of the Constitution. I think we have to emphasize that. Our legislation in no way, shape, or form infringes upon any individual rights protected under the First Amendment of the Constitution. It simply and specifically provides clarity on the definition that the Department of Education can and will use for defining anti-Semitic acts.

We must act now. This increase in religiously motivated hate crimes must be addressed. It must be addressed by the entire American family, and it ought to start here. We will come together because we will not allow others to tear us apart. We must hold to the ideals that our Nation was founded on and promote freedom of religion. We must protect that freedom and encourage it. We must—as a Nation, as an American family—call out hate wherever and whenever we see it.

I thank Senator CASEY for his involvement and leadership on such an important issue.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I would like to thank Senators SCOTT and CASEY for their work on the anti-discrimination legislation, particularly as it relates to anti-Semitism. I support them in that effort and look forward to getting something done in Congress to help address the definition of anti-Semitism for the Department of Education.

Mr. SCOTT. 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 10) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 10

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 “Anti-Semitism Awareness Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (referred to in the section as “title VI”) is one of the principal antidiscrimination statutes enforced by the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights.

(2) Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

(3) Both the Department of Justice and the Department of Education have properly concluded that title VI prohibits discrimination against Jews, Muslims, Sikhs, and members of other religious groups when the discrimination is based on the group's actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics or when the discrimination is based on actual or perceived citizenship or residence in a country whose residents share a dominant religion or a distinct religious identity.

(4) A September 8, 2010 letter from Assistant Attorney General Thomas E. Perez to Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights Russlynn H. Ali stated that “[a]lthough Title VI does not prohibit discrimination on the basis of religion, discrimination against Jews, Muslims, Sikhs, and members of other groups violates Title VI when that discrimination is based on the group's actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics”.

(5) To assist State and local educational agencies and schools in their efforts to comply with Federal law, the Department of Education periodically issues Dear Colleague letters. On a number of occasions, these letters set forth the Department of Education's interpretation of the statutory and regulatory obligations of schools under title VI.

(6) On September 13, 2004, the Department of Education issued a Dear Colleague letter regarding the obligations of schools (including colleges) under title VI to address incidents involving religious discrimination. The 2004 letter specifically notes that “since the attacks of September 11, 2001, OCR has received complaints of race or national origin harassment commingled with aspects of religious discrimination against Arab Muslim, Sikh, and Jewish students.”

(7) An October 26, 2010 Dear Colleague letter issued by the Department of Education stated, “While Title VI does not cover discrimination based solely on religion, groups that face discrimination on the basis of actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics may not be denied protection under Title VI on the ground that they also share a common faith. These principles apply not just to Jewish students, but also to students from any discrete religious group that shares, or is perceived to share, ancestry or ethnic characteristics (e.g., Muslims or Sikhs).”

(8) Anti-Semitism remains a persistent, disturbing problem in elementary and secondary schools and on college campuses.

(9) Jewish students are being threatened, harassed, or intimidated in their schools (including on their campuses) on the basis of their shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics including through harassing conduct that creates a hostile environment so severe, pervasive, or persistent so as to interfere

with or limit some students' ability to participate in or benefit from the services, activities, or opportunities offered by schools.

(10) The 2010 Dear Colleague letter cautioned schools that they “must take prompt and effective steps reasonably calculated to end the harassment, eliminate any hostile environment, and its effects, and prevent the harassment from recurring,” but did not provide guidance on current manifestation of anti-Semitism, including discriminatory anti-Semitic conduct that is couched as anti-Israel or anti-Zionist.

(11) The definition and examples referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 3 have been valuable tools to help identify contemporary manifestations of anti-Semitism, and include useful examples of discriminatory anti-Israel conduct that crosses the line into anti-Semitism.

(12) Awareness of this definition of anti-Semitism will increase understanding of the parameters of contemporary anti-Jewish conduct and will assist the Department of Education in determining whether an investigation of anti-Semitism under title VI is warranted.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the term “definition of anti-Semitism”—

(1) includes the definition of anti-Semitism set forth by the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism of the Department of State in the Fact Sheet issued on June 8, 2010, as adapted from the Working Definition of Anti-Semitism of the European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia (now known as the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights); and

(2) includes the examples set forth under the headings “Contemporary Examples of Anti-Semitism” and “What is Anti-Semitism Relative to Israel?” of the Fact Sheet.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION FOR TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.

In reviewing, investigating, or deciding whether there has been a violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) on the basis of race, color, or national origin, based on an individual's actual or perceived shared Jewish ancestry or Jewish ethnic characteristics, the Department of Education shall take into consideration the definition of anti-Semitism as part of the Department's assessment of whether the alleged practice was motivated by anti-Semitic intent.

SEC. 5. CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS.

Nothing in this Act, or an amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to diminish or infringe upon any right protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TSUNAMI WARNING, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2015—
Continued

TRIBUTE TO TRECIA BICKFORD MCEVOY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today, not a minute too late, not a minute too early but at the exact time I am scheduled to speak. That is because of a remarkable woman, my

scheduler Trecia Bickford McEvoy. Trecia has dedicated 25 years of her life to serving her country and the United States Senate. She has worked for a Republican, she has worked for an Independent, and she has worked for a Democrat, a true bipartisan public servant we can all learn a thing or two from.

As a farmer, the schedule is rigorous but simple: You plant, you harvest, and then everything else in between, but when I got to the Senate, I found Washington, DC, is not as cut and dry as the farm. Luckily for me, after Trecia served Vermont Senator Jim Jefford's office for over 15 years, she came to my office to help me and my staff find the bathrooms.

Since 2008, I have been lucky enough to have her in my office, and the State of Montana is better off for it. Thanks to her remarkable work, I have been able to see thousands of Montanans, in between thousands of committee hearings and briefings and runs to the airport, all because of an airtight schedule curated by Trecia.

At an all-staff meeting, one of my staffers was asked to draw a picture of what she believes Trecia does every day. With her trademark humility, Trecia said: "Well, that would be kind of boring," but what landed on that paper was a set of hands, a generous set of hands, that ensures that all Montanans can engage with the important policy decisions that shape our lives every day.

Trecia acts as the hands that carry Montanans from all across the State to see their Senator. It is not boring at all. In fact, it is really important. If scheduling was an art, my schedules would be enshrined not just on my Web site but also down the street at the National Gallery. Trecia would know exactly how many minutes it takes every day to drive from the Hill to the museum.

As my colleagues know, a good scheduler is hard to find and even harder to keep. Trecia has shown a staying quality that puts her in the Scheduler Hall of Fame, a hall that would be erected along the road from the Capitol to National Airport. Whether it is a call from my farm at 3 a.m. to tell her I am going to miss my flight because my truck can't make it through the snow or a text from the plane in Minneapolis asking which gate I need to get to for a tight connection, Trecia has always been ready and willing to answer the call.

After 25 years on the Hill, I know I am not the only one who can attest to Trecia's talents as a scheduler, as a friend, and as a person. She is a critical part of my office, not only because she keeps me on schedule, but she is also a relentless mentor to my younger staffers, always sharing in their joys and consoling them in their tougher times.

I will never forget that the first time I met Trecia is when I interviewed her for the job as my scheduler. A few months earlier, my wife and I had just

been on an airplane from Seattle to Washington National Airport. My wife sat in the middle seat in row 12, and I sat in the middle seat in row 27.

I said to Trecia: What is going to happen when you schedule me on a cross-country flight in a middle seat in the back of the plane and my wife in a middle seat in the front of the plane?

She looked at me and said: That ain't ever going to happen.

And it never has.

Her smarts, her generosity, and her quick wit not only make my life easier but also make the lives of other Senators' staffs and, most importantly, Montanans' easier. As one of my former chiefs of staff pointed out, whether it is a veteran from Columbia Falls, a high school student from Billings, or a mom from Havre, Trecia has played a vital role in improving the lives of everyday Montanans. They may not know who made that moment happen, but I do.

To me and to many others on the Hill and in the office, Trecia is more than just a scheduler. When I asked for the quintessential Trecia McEvoy story, one of her former bosses told a story—not about Trecia getting a meeting scheduled or pulling off an air traffic miracle, but they told a story about Trecia the coworker and friend. According to one of her former chiefs of staff, Trecia would give a secret heads-up to young, junior staff members any time their boss was coming by so that their pencils were sharpened and everything was on the up and up, even late on a Friday afternoon long after the Senator had flown home. This type of kindness, humor, and leadership shines through with Trecia's work every day.

Whether it is a bright-eyed intern from Helena looking for a place to live for the summer, the ambitious staff assistant looking for professional guidance, or the know-it-all executive assistant who thinks he knows best, Trecia has been there to give advice, to listen, and to keep all of us grounded in a town where often the only thing bigger than the monuments are the egos.

Despite a reputation as a miracle worker, her greatest accomplishment has been balancing the hectic profession of a scheduler with her critically important duties as a parent. When I call on Thursday night because a flight is delayed, it is not uncommon for me to hear in the background the cheer of a crowd from Ian's hockey game or a hushed whisper from an audience at one of Zachary's plays. Despite the long hours, frantic phone calls, and countless emails, Trecia's No. 1 priority has always been crystal clear: her family. Over the past 25 years, Trecia and her husband Jeff have made sure that their kids—Alexis, Zachary, and Ian—have everything they need to be able to succeed.

In the office and in life, Trecia is more than a scheduler. What has made Trecia a great scheduler over the years are the same qualities that have made her a great friend, counselor, and

mother. Trecia's generosity, sympathetic ear, sharp wit, and understanding nature have made her a phenomenal scheduler, a great friend, and, most importantly, an ideal mother.

On behalf of Montana, Vermont, countless staff members, and from this dirt farmer from Big Sandy, I thank Trecia for 25 years of service.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

OVERTIME RULE

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, as we enter the holiday season, today should be a special day for 4.2 million working Americans, including 75,000 Minnesotans. That is because today was supposed to be the day that the overtime rule would go into effect to ensure that workers are paid overtime wages when they work more than 40 hours in a week. Instead, the rule has been blocked, meaning that many of these working people will not be able to benefit from this rule, which is especially unfortunate given that the holidays are coming upon us. Right now, these 4.2 million employees don't have to be paid at all for overtime work they perform. That is what we are trying to change.

As you know, we had a big election in which working people sent the clear message they are hurting. Yet less than a month later, Republicans have decided to attack a rule that would ensure that American workers are paid for every hour they work. This is exactly the type of policy we should all be able to agree on to help working people across the country.

During the campaign, President-Elect Trump repeatedly said he was for working people. One important action he could take immediately would be to go on his twitter account and express support for the overtime rule.

Here is why this rule matters so much. As our economy has changed in the past couple of decades, the rule on overtime pay has not kept pace at all. The last meaningful improvement for workers covered by this rule came in 1975, when the rule made 62 percent of so-called administrative and professional employees eligible for overtime pay. As a result of failing to keep the rule up-to-date and current with the rate of inflation, right now only 7 percent of employees in that category must be paid overtime.

The Obama administration's update to the overtime rule was intended to change the fact that under the standard right now, employers aren't required to pay overtime to these employees unless the employees earn less than \$23,000 a year. If you are paid on a salary basis and earn more than

\$23,000 a year, your employer can make you work more than 40 hours a week and not pay you anything at all for your extra hours. Twenty-three thousand dollars is simply too low of a threshold. A salary of \$23,000 a year is below the poverty line for a family of four. I believe workers and their families deserve better.

That is why the Obama administration instituted an update to the overtime rule, to lift the salary threshold to \$47,000 a year, bringing it closer to the original standard in place in 1975. It still wouldn't be as high as the comparable level in 1975, but it would be a vast improvement, and it would mean that 4.2 million more workers across the United States would qualify for overtime pay.

Consider a retail manager making a salary of \$40,000 a year at a big box store or fast-food chain. Right now, many employers are legally allowed to require such an employee to work 50, 60 or more hours in a week without paying him or her anything extra. This new rule would mean the employee would be paid extra when they work more than 40 hours a week.

Similarly, the rule would make sure a trucking dispatcher earning \$45,000 a year would not be forced to work late at night without compensation. The rule encourages his or her employer to send employees home to his or her family on time or else the employer will pay them for the overtime he or she works.

This is very important for working men and women in America. That is why many of my colleagues and I have been strong supporters of this rule. That is why it has been very disappointing to see so many of my Republican colleagues attack and ultimately try to dismantle this rule.

They have been attacking the rule ever since it was proposed. They have set out on a campaign to delay, to water down, or to block the rule entirely. In the Senate, 45 Republicans have signed on to a bill to block it. In the House, 202 Members have signed on to a companion measure to that bill. House Speaker PAUL RYAN claims the rule is an "absolute disaster," and Senator VITTER claims the rule will "reduce worker's opportunity for long-term advancement and increased pay."

Despite their attacks on this updated rule in the House and in the Senate, Republicans weren't able to block it through the legislative process. So they took their fight to the courts, where they used their old tactic of forum shopping, where they file a suit in the court they think is most likely to be favorable for their arguments. As a result, 9 days ago, they convinced a Texas judge to put the updated overtime rule on hold. The 4.2 million workers who today were scheduled to be paid for every hour they work above the 40 could continue to be forced to work overtime without the additional compensation they deserve.

As our economy has continued to recover from the Great Recession, too

much of the wealth in the last few years has accrued to the top 1 percent in this country and often the top one-tenth of 1 percent. While new data suggests the economy has improved a bit for middle-class workers since last year, the median household income in the United States remains lower than it was in the year 2000 in real dollars. Updating our overtime pay rule is one of the most effective steps we can take to put working people back on a more level economic playing field.

I hope my colleagues will join me today in pledging to fight in Congress, the executive branch, and the courts for a fairer system for all workers and for updating this incredibly outdated overtime rule. Let's hope that the postponement of the new rule today will be temporary. Let's join forces on behalf of American workers to stand strong in support of a fair overtime rule and to work together to build a stronger American middle class.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments made by my colleague from Minnesota. He has been a strong champion for America's workers and believes we should make this Nation and our economy work for working Americans. His leadership on this overtime rule is certainly much appreciated.

Today should be a day of celebration. It should be a day in which 4 million American workers who work overtime without getting paid but earn very modest salaries were going to get rewarded for their overtime work—get paid for their overtime work—but instead those 4 million Americans are getting scrooged.

You all remember the story of Ebenezer Scrooge. He made a lot of money as a very successful businessman. He enjoyed counting his coins while treating his workers in a terrible fashion and paying them as little as he could get away with. That is exactly what is at stake with this overtime rule. The vision of the overtime rule was that when you had a very well-paid manager who was clearly earning far more than they would if they were earning a more modest amount plus overtime, you could reduce the complexity of tracking their overtime hours and instead simply pay them a salary without compensation for overtime. The key to that was that it was a very well-paid worker or manager and not someone earning near the bottom of the scale and barely making more than minimum wage.

As I said, today should be a day of celebration with the overtime rule being modified so that it would catch up with inflation. Many decades have passed since it was put forward. It was supposed to be adjusted for inflation from here forward, but it was not adjusted.

This is not a day of celebration; it is a day in which approximately 4 million

Americans are getting scrooged, and that also means 40,000 Oregonians who were looking forward to finally getting compensated for the overtime they will be working during this coming holiday season will also be told: No go. No paycheck. No compensation for your overtime.

These folks earn as little as \$23,000 a year. Going into the holidays, a lot of retail workers are asked to work far more than 40 hours a week. They are asked to work 50, 60, 70, 80 hours a week without a dime of overtime, and that is wrong.

A whole lot of these workers are parents raising children. It is pretty hard to raise a child on \$23,000 a year. I don't think anyone in this Chamber—any one of the Senators here in this Chamber—has raised a child on \$23,000 a year. If they had attempted to do so, they would have an understanding of why they should be up here right now joining this fight for the overtime rule—which is hopelessly outdated and hopelessly unfair to America's workers—to be implemented in a timely fashion with legislation that we could pass today. Instead, Senators with their far larger salaries are very happily preparing for their holiday without considering that today is a day in which 4 million American workers are getting treated unfairly.

Since 1975, the salary of full-time workers who qualify for overtime has plummeted from 62 percent to 7 percent. That is a pretty dramatic reduction. For over a year now, millions of American workers have been looking forward to today when their long hours of overtime were finally going to be compensated, and it is only fair that they have that compensation. But just like Ebenezer Scrooge, the Republican Party, in coordination with 21 States, has said to those 4 million American workers: Bah humbug. You don't get compensated for your overtime. We are putting a lump of coal in your stocking, and it is too bad that you are trying to raise kids. This happened because States filed a lawsuit and got a preliminary injunction granted by a judge to take away the power of today's overtime rule, the modified overtime rule, to assist American workers.

I grew up in a blue-collar family. My dad was a mechanic, and my mother was a stay-at-home mom. My father, who had a basic blue-collar wage, was able to put food on the table, buy a three-bedroom ranch house with a garage, acquire a car, and have modest family camping vacations. It was a pretty square deal to provide a foundation for his children to thrive and have opportunities by working with his hands. Our blue-collar community was in much the same situation. When he worked overtime and stayed on the job because a machine needed to be repaired and finished in time for a client of the company to be able to put that heavy equipment to work to build highways, work in the forest, or work to build dams, he got paid for that

overtime, and it was right and fair that he did.

It is not right and fair that today America's workers are not getting paid for their overtime. They are working longer and harder only to see that extra wealth go to the CEO of the company. American workers are working longer hours, but their wages and paychecks are getting spread thinner and thinner. The overtime rule is a long overdue adjustment for those who are working those long hours. You don't get any help from this rule if you are not working more than 40 hours a week.

When President Franklin Roosevelt was talking about the importance of living wages to support families, he said: "By living wages I mean more than a bare subsistence level—I mean the wages of decent living." Isn't that what we are talking about, the wages of decent living?

Is there anyone who would contend that a parent raising a child on \$23,000 a year is making a wage that would allow them to have a decent living? I don't think so, at least not at the cost of what it is to exist in today's society, not when rent on a two-bedroom apartment is \$800 to \$900 in Portland, not when the cost of groceries is where it is, and not when the cost of health care is where it is. Franklin Roosevelt said that no one who works full time should live in poverty. He said that working Americans should make enough to raise and support a family and provide a foundation for their children to thrive. He meant that you should be able to earn enough to save up over time and retire with dignity. He meant that a working American should be able to earn enough to cover the basic necessities of life, such as food, clothes, and shelter, but for many Americans, those goals are out of reach even though they are working a lot of overtime, overtime in which they are not getting paid. We just haven't kept pace with the vision of families being able to earn, as Roosevelt put it, the wages of a decent living—the wages that enable you to live decently. This rule is critical to changing and fixing that.

While the courts tie up the process at the request of my Republican colleagues and State governments, we should instead have a bill here on the floor and simply pass this adjustment ourselves.

Has anyone noticed that we just had a Presidential campaign in which both candidates talked about making America work for working Americans? The candidate who won the vote in the electoral college but lost the popular vote, by the way, has claimed he is going to watch out for working Americans. Well, where is he today on the day 4 million Americans are getting scrooged? Where is Donald Trump today on the day that those who worked overtime are now told they will not get paid for that overtime? How about a tweet in the middle of the night saying: I get it.

If we return to the story of Ebenezer Scrooge, we remember the fact that he was resisting any effort to enable his employee, Bob Cratchit, to have Christmas Day off with his family or to be able to have a decent amount of food on the table on that day. His heart was a few sizes too small. The night before Christmas he had a dream, and in that dream ghosts of Christmas past, Christmas present, and Christmas future came to him and showed the poverty—the spiritual poverty of his life. They showed him the emptiness of his life. That life is not about building up treasures you can count coin by coin, but helping other families to thrive and succeed and share in their joy. When he woke up, he was a changed man. He woke up and said: Yes, my team—my workers—shouldn't be working on Christmas Day. Yes, I should pay them more. Yes, I should make sure they have bountiful food so they can care for their family. Yes, their son, Tiny Tim, should have the health care he needs so he can live a full and productive life. He took care of these things and personally went out and acquired the largest turkey he could for the Cratchit family.

Isn't today the day when my colleagues who have been playing the role of Ebenezer Scrooge and fighting fair compensation for overtime—isn't today the day when they should take a nap and go to sleep tonight and have a little bit of a dream about the circumstances of working Americans? Here we are, just coming off a campaign where everyone talked about the plight of working Americans. Maybe a little of that should reverberate in their dreams tonight so that they might think about how families are struggling across America and how hard it is to put food on the table, not just during the holiday season but throughout the year. They should think about how unfair it is for someone to work 80 hours a week and not get paid overtime because they are being paid only \$23,000 a year.

Do I hear a single colleague volunteer to work for 80 hours a week for a year and get paid \$23,000? I would love to hear that speech on this floor when someone says: I get it. I am all for the overtime rule of the past because I am willing to live on \$23,000 a year.

I don't think I have heard that from a single colleague. Colleagues here are paid many times that increment. Maybe it is a little hard to understand the plight of American workers when you are living in a bubble. Think about what it would be like to raise a family on \$23,000 a year, given the expenses you experience in today's society.

So tonight, let's have a few of our colleagues who have been such advocates of the Ebenezer Scrooge strategy of denying overtime to workers who are paid very little go to sleep and maybe get visited by the ghosts of the past and the present and the future. Maybe they will be able to put themselves in the same pair of shoes that

working Americans work in and place themselves in the same set of circumstances and financial challenges that American workers have. Maybe they can wake up tomorrow with a different vision—a vision of being a partner with working America—to make this Nation work for working America, make our economy work for working America. Maybe they can come to this floor and insist that we immediately pass a bill to take care of these workers so they are compensated for their overtime. That would be a Christmas story to celebrate.

Maybe, while we are at it, our President-elect can tweet tonight in the middle of the night that he had a dream and he was visited by the ghosts of the past and the present and the future and he saw a vision of treating workers fairly, and he wants the Senate to act tomorrow morning. Wouldn't that be a fabulous Christmas story—one that is completely consistent with the rhetoric we heard in the campaign about an economy that works for working Americans. I hope tomorrow morning that is exactly what we hear.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, one of the things I have been focused on—and I know many of my colleagues have been as well, such as the Presiding Officer—in the last couple of years in the Senate is coming to the Senate floor and speaking about this issue, certainly one of the most important issues we can be focused on in the Congress, and that is the economy and the economic growth for the United States.

What we have here, shown by this chart, is really a lost decade of economic growth that we have had in America over the last 10 years—a lost decade. This chart reflects the gross domestic product, or GDP growth, in the United States over the last several decades. GDP is essentially really a measure of the health of the economy, the health of the opportunity that we have in this country. By any measure, over the last 10 years we have had a sick economy.

So if we look here at the 3-percent GDP growth, this is OK growth. It is not considered that great. The average rate of growth for the United States over the last 200 years—what really has made our country great—has been about 3.9 percent, almost 4 percent. Three percent is not great. It is certainly below average. But we have a President—President Obama—and an administration that is going to be the first President ever to never in 1 year, even once, hit 3 percent GDP growth ever.

Let me cite a couple of recent numbers. In the fourth quarter of 2015, we grew at 0.9 percent of GDP and did not even hit 1 percent. In the first quarter of 2016, it was 0.8 percent of GDP. In the second quarter of 2016, it was 1.1

percent GDP growth. It is true that the third quarter numbers came out estimated just a little above 3 percent for the quarter, but the year will be way off of even 3 percent.

Again, traditional levels of American growth are close to 4 percent.

So each quarter, when these numbers have come out—these dismal, anemic economic growth numbers—what I have tried to do is come to the Senate floor, talk about the issue, and then ask the question: Where is the Secretary of the Treasury? Where is the President of the United States? What is the plan? Is this really what we expect for Americans? We can't even hit 3 percent GDP growth.

Look at every other administration, including Kennedy, Johnson, Eisenhower, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan—holy cow—6 percent, 5.5 percent; Bill Clinton, 4.5, 5 percent; even George Bush, well above 3 percent. Not once in 8 years—the lost decade of economic growth under President Obama. That is with low energy prices, and that is with super-low interest rates.

So when we ask what the plan is, what the administration is doing to grow the economy, they come back and say: Well, listen, the new normal is about 2 percent, 1.5 percent GDP growth. They don't say we are going to grow the economy. They just dumb down American expectations. Go google the term "new normal." Everybody uses it now in Washington. Essentially, they are saying that 1.5, 2 percent GDP growth is the best we can do.

I have a lot of respect for my colleague from Oregon, but if you want to talk about an Ebenezer Scrooge strategy—growing the U.S. economy at 1.5 percent and not even trying to grow at traditional levels of American growth—that is the ultimate Ebenezer Scrooge strategy because the entire country, especially middle class families, are hurt by it.

So this answer that, no, we can't even hit 3 percent, that the new normal is 1.5, 2 percent, that is an answer that we get from the Obama administration. The Secretary of the Treasury never comes out and tells us how we are going to get back to traditional levels of growth. That is an answer that consigns millions of Americans to lives where they no longer believe in economic opportunity, no longer believe in strong wages and in terms of growth for our wages, and no longer believe in a future in which their kids are going to do better than they did.

We talk a lot about stats, which are important to understand. So let me give my colleagues some of the numbers behind them. In the last 8 years, we have now had, in terms of people working in the workforce, the lowest labor-force participation rate since 1978. What does that mean? Again, that is a health issue of our economy. It means that millions of Americans have just quit looking for work. Can we imagine being that discouraged because the economy is not growing and so you just quit looking?

The percentage of Americans below the poverty line has grown by almost 4 percent over this period, where we see no growth. Real medium household income during this period sank by almost \$2,000. Food stamp participation in this period—again, 8 years—has soared by almost 40 percent. The percentage of Americans who own homes, which is one of the ultimate markers of the American dream, is the lowest it has been since 1965. So we were talking about Ebenezer Scrooge. My colleague was just talking about him. Those are Ebenezer Scrooge numbers, and those are Americans who are hurting because we can't grow the economy.

We need to change that. The Obama administration has not been focused on this issue. We never hear the Secretary of the Treasury come out—or even the President—and talk about how we get back to traditional levels of American growth, like every Republican and Democratic President has done for decades. They don't talk about it. They haven't been focused on it. But I think on November 8, we saw that the American people are very focused on this issue. Millions and millions of Americans rejected the idea that, because of these growth rates, they had to give up on the American dream and a strong U.S. economy and good jobs. They did not want to give up on it. We do not want to give up on that.

In essence, Americans saw that the idea of the new normal—which is this, peddled by the Obama administration—is a surrender, and they didn't want to surrender. We shouldn't surrender. We need to grow this economy.

So what now? Well, I find it very encouraging that the President-elect and his team, including his nominee for the Secretary of the Treasury, have been talking very regularly about this issue. We need to grow the economy—not at new normal rates of 1.5 percent or 2 percent but at 3, 3.5, or 4 percent GDP growth. That is what we need to do. We in this body need to help them do that because that is what the American people want. In fact, with the exception of having a strong military and keeping this country safe in terms of national defense, growing our economy, creating economic opportunity for all Americans is certainly one of the most important things we can do in the Senate. But we need a partner in the executive branch. We need a partner in the executive branch that is actually focused on the issue, that actually cares about these numbers, and we haven't had it in 8 years. So where do we start?

I think we need to start on this issue of the overregulation of our economy. Again, the incoming administration has talked a lot about this issue. When we ask people outside of Washington what is keeping our economy down, they refer to this. This chart is a chart of the cumulative number of Federal rules that have come out of this town onto American businesses, small businesses, and working-class families. That is what we see—pure growth, pure growth.

President Obama has enacted more than 600 new major regulations, totaling close to \$800 billion or \$2,300 per American. What is really interesting is that, despite the fact that the American people on November 8 said they want to grow the economy and they don't want to see this continue, this administration is putting its pedal to the metal on trying to see how many more regulations they can issue and promulgate to crush our economy and opportunity.

My State has been ground zero for a lot of these regulations. We are a resource development State in Alaska. The President just last week came out with a new regulation that said: I know that the vast majority of Alaskans want to responsibly develop their resources, but I am going to take the entire Outer Continental Shelf off the table for Alaska. Sorry, Alaska. Sorry, workers. Sorry, American energy independence. I am taking it all off the table. That was a regulation the President put on the table and issued last week that is going to hurt our economy, that is going to hurt American energy independence, that is going to hurt jobs, that is going to hurt our national security, and he did it anyway. There are no leases in my State because the President, in Executive order, issued that. That is not what the American people voted for on November 8.

So several Senators, led by Senator GARDNER, are going to be sending the President a letter very soon saying: Mr. President, the American people have spoken. The American people are tired of this. You are on your way out. Please, respect the results of the election and quit issuing these regulations that are stifling economic growth and crushing middle-class families. I hope he will abide by that. I hope he listens to us. I hope he listens to the American people. But, somehow, I think we are going to see even more of these in the next month or so.

I wish to conclude by noting something that I think most Americans understand intuitively. When it comes to our Nation and the comparative advantages that we have over other countries—and I am talking about the major countries in the world, whether it is China or Russia or the EU or Brazil or Japan—we have so many incredible comparative advantages relative to anyone. We have energy. We have great entrepreneurs. We have world class universities. We have agriculture and fisheries that literally feed the world. We have some of the brightest young people, like our pages here. We have a military that is the most professional and lethal in the world, by far. We have alliances all over the world where countries want to be close to the United States. Our adversaries and potential adversaries, such as China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran, have very few, if any, allies.

We have so many advantages, and yet the majority of Americans think we

are heading in the wrong direction. I believe they think that because we can't grow the economy. So what we need to do is for all of us to work closely with the new administration, and I would encourage all of my colleagues here in the Senate to focus back on this issue. We need to return to traditional levels of American economic growth, and we can do it with the right policies.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 579

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Members of the Senate, I come to the floor to speak about and to propound a unanimous consent request in regard to the Inspector General's Empowerment Act. I would like to defer. I ask unanimous consent to not lose the floor but yield to Senator JOHNSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for letting me speak to a very important issue. I also thank him for his leadership. Long before I came to the Senate, I know the Senator from Iowa was working tirelessly to make sure government was more efficient, more effective, and more accountable. He has done an awful lot of work to ensure that. Certainly he has relied on inspectors general to bolster his efforts.

So I am completely in support of S. 579, the Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2015. When I took over the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Senator from Iowa had been working long and hard on this act. I was happy—I was pleased to utilize our committee to move this bill through our committee unanimously.

The bill has 18 bipartisan cosponsors. It is just incredibly important. The Senator from Iowa will certainly fill us in on the details of what has happened and what has made this bill so important. I just want to spend a little bit of time on how important inspector generals are.

We, working together with the Senator from Iowa, asked the inspectors general, for example, to report back to us how many of their recommendations—off of their tireless work—have gone unimplemented. We just received that report. Over 15,000 recommendations from inspectors general have not been implemented. The total aggregate savings could be as high as \$87 billion. Even in this massive Federal Government, \$87 billion is real money. Of course, inspectors general need access to the records from their agencies,

from their departments, so they can determine what is happening so they can make these kind of recommendations.

We also have had and witnessed a real tragedy, for example, at the Tomah VA Medical Center. We had an inspector general who had inspected and investigated over 140 different instances, then issued reports on those inspections, investigations, and then buried those reports—did not make those reports public.

One of those had to do with the Tomah VA Center in terms of the overprescription of opioids. Because that report was not made public, we were unaware of the problems there, and the problems persisted. For over a decade, opioids were being overprescribed. The result was that veterans—the finest among us—some of them died because of overprescription.

It is not an overstatement to say that the work of the inspector general is crucial and that work—those reports, those inspections, those investigations—literally is the difference between life and death. Again, I am here supporting the Senator from Iowa in his tireless efforts to get this bill passed, the Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2015. I urge all of my colleagues to allow this to pass by unanimous consent so we can get this put on the President's desk and it can be signed into law as quickly as possible.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, while I am waiting for Senator McCAIN to come to the floor before I speak about the specific unanimous consent request I am going to make, I would like to point out, in a very general way, that the pursuit of what we are doing, in so many other ways, is part of Congress's constitutional responsibility and constitutional authority under the checks and balances of government to make sure the laws are faithfully executed.

There are several different tools that are used in that direction. They can be individual Senators. Any time an individual Senator wants to ask questions of whether the laws are being faithfully executed, that Senator can do it, that Member of the House of Representatives can do it, through the particular committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, through both letter as well as open hearings about certain subjects of whether money being spent by the executive branch is according to Congressional intent or whether laws are being carried out the way Congress intended.

That is all part of congressional oversight, but there has also been seen a need, over a course of many years, for other ways to make sure it is done. One of those was the setting up of the Government Accountability Office that has authority, at the request of committees and request of individual Members of Congress, to investigate and do research on certain problems we have in the executive branch of government.

That predates, by a long time, the passage of the inspectors general law that we are dealing with, with this subject I have before the Senate now. The inspector general was set up for the purpose of being within the executive branch to see that the laws are faithfully executed and the money spent according to Congress. I see that Senator McCAIN has come to the floor. I would like to make my opening statement on the legislation. I thank Senator McCAIN for the courtesy he gives me to come and listen to my request. Whatever he decides to do with it will be his choice, but I want to tell him I appreciate the cooperation he has given me on so many different things.

To justify my unanimous consent request, I start out with some of the issues that are involved with the legislation, the Inspector General Empowerment Act. In 1978, Congress created inspectors general or IGs as they are often known, to be the eyes and ears within the executive branch.

These independent watchdogs are designed to keep Congress and the public informed about waste, fraud, and abuse in government. They also help agency leaders identify problems and inefficiencies they may not be aware of. IGs are a very critical part to good governance and to the rule of law.

In order for IGs to do their job, they need independent access to information. That is why, when Congress passed the Inspector General Act of 1978, we explicitly said IGs should have access to all records of the agency they are charged with overseeing.

However, since 2010, more and more agencies have refused to comply with this legal obligation. This obstruction has slowed down far too many important investigations, ranging from sexual assault in the Peace Corps to the FBI's exercise of anti-terrorism authority under the PATRIOT Act.

Those are just two of the things I have been involved in. Every one of the other 99 Senators would probably have to say that in their oversight work, somehow the executive branch agencies have not carried out the spirit of the 1978 legislation.

It got worse in July of 2016. The Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel released a memo supporting this obstruction of congressional intent. Now, let me put this in a commonsense form that surely everybody ought to understand. In 1978, Congress passes the inspectors general law. It is voted on by a majority of the Congress. It is sent to the President. The President signs it. It has been law since that period of time, but we have a situation where 1 bureaucrat out of 2 million Federal employees sits and reads something into a piece of legislation that was never intended because the legislation says the inspector general should be entitled to all records, but the Office of Legal Counsel opinion says: Well, maybe not all. It kind of depends on the head of the department. There are some exceptions in the inspectors general law that ought to be there—those

are spelled out—some of them dealing with national security, some of them dealing with the Department of Defense, as just one example.

So we have this opinion in July of 2016. The memo argued that Congress did not mean what it very clearly said; that the IG gets access to all records. This is unacceptable. It undermines Congress's intent. It undermines the rule of law. It makes a mockery of government transparency. The public deserves a robust scrutiny of the Federal Government. Every eighth grade civics student understands what checks and balances is all about.

Congressional oversight is one of those checks. Since September 2015, a bipartisan group of Senators and I have been working to overturn the Justice Department's opinion through S. 579, the Inspector General Empowerment Act. Among other things, this bill further clarifies that Congress intended IGs to access all agency records, notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless—and this is a big unless—other laws specifically state that the IGs are not entitled to receive such access.

A lot of those fall into the area of national security and defense. The bill has a total of 20 cosponsors, including seven of my Democratic colleagues: MCCASKILL, CARPER, MIKULSKI, WYDEN, BALDWIN, MANCHIN and PETERS. At the Judiciary Committee hearing in August of last year, Senator LEAHY also agreed that this access problem needs to be fixed by legislation because it is "blocking what was once a free flow of information." Even the Justice Department witness at that hearing disagreed with the results of the Office of Legal Counsel opinion and supported legislative action to solve the problem.

As of today, a large majority of Senators, the Las Vegas Review Journal—and I say that for the benefit of Senator REID who at one time objected—the New York Times, the Washington Post, good governance groups like Project on Government Oversight and Citizens Against Government Waste, all support restoring the intent of that act through S. 579.

I want to emphasize that the intent of the act was destroyed by one bureaucrat writing a legal opinion that has been a crutch for a lot of people who don't want to cooperate with the inspector general.

Despite strong bipartisan and public support for the bill, we have not been able to pass the bill by unanimous consent. We attempted to pass the bill by unanimous consent September 2015 and again December 2015.

In December, the Armed Services Committee and the Intelligence Committee raised concerns about the bill. It is perfectly legitimate for them to do that. My cosponsors and I worked with our colleagues on those committees to address and resolve their concerns. Ultimately, Chairman MCCAIN and Chairman BURR lifted their holds, and in December 2015 the bill cleared

the Republican side with no objections. But when we tried to pass the bill on the floor by unanimous consent, Senator REID, as I previously said, objected on the Democratic side.

In the meantime, the House passed its own version of the bill. Since then, we have worked closely with the House to resolve minor differences between the House and Senate bills. Now it is time to press forward and finally pass this critical bill to ensure the effective oversight of waste, fraud, and abuse in government—in other words, to make very clear that when the act says they are entitled to all records, "all" means all.

There is one provision of the bill we had to remove from this version at the insistence of Senator LEAHY. It relates to testimonial subpoena authority for inspectors general.

First, let me be clear about why the testimonial subpoena authority is important to the ability of IGs to conduct effective investigations. When employees of the U.S. Government are accused of wrongdoing or misconduct, IGs should be able to conduct a full and thorough investigation. Unfortunately, employees who may have violated that trust are often able to evade the IG's inquiry simply by retiring from the government. Testimonial subpoena authority empowers IGs to obtain testimony about waste, fraud, and abuse from employees after they leave the agency.

Similarly, the subpoena authority helps IGs investigate entities that receive Federal funds. In other words, if you want to know what is wrong, follow the money. The subpoena authority enables IGs to require testimony from government contractors, subcontractors, grantees, and subgrantees. Currently, most IGs can subpoena documents from entities outside of their agency, but most cannot subpoena testimony. The ability to require witnesses outside the agency to talk to the IG can be critical in carrying out an inspector general's statutory duties or recovering wasted Federal funds.

Let me also be clear that when we learned of Senator LEAHY's concerns with this provision in November 2015, my bipartisan cosponsors and I worked in good faith for 12 months to address them. We offered at least half a dozen accommodations that would provide meaningful and appropriate limitations on the subpoena in question, but Senator LEAHY continued to demand the removal of that from the bill.

Despite a year of negotiation, we were unable to reach a resolution, so I proposed bringing the provision to the floor for debate. I offered Senator LEAHY the option of debating on the floor the merits of the testimonial subpoena authority so that the Senate could vote on whether to keep or remove the provision from the bill, but my colleague declined to agree to floor time so that we could have an open debate on the issue.

His continued refusal to debate and vote on the much needed testimonial

subpoena authority threatens to derail the entire bill, which has such substantial bipartisan public support.

Despite my strong belief that IGs need that subpoena authority, I also recognize that the IG bill contains many other critical provisions the IG needs to move forward with it, and now is the time to do that. We cannot afford to wait any longer for those provisions that empower the IG. This bill is still necessary to help IGs and to ensure to the American people that there is transparency and accountability within the government.

Before I ask unanimous consent, I wish to say for the benefit of the position that I think Senator MCCAIN is going to take that the Secretary, under existing law, may block an IG investigation if it is necessary to preserve the national security and interests of the United States and if the information the IG has requested concerns any one of five categories: sensitive operation plans, intelligence matters, counterintelligence matters, ongoing criminal investigations, or other matters that would constitute a serious threat to national security if they were to be disclosed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 68, S. 579. I further ask that the Johnson substitute amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the hard work the Senator from Iowa and his staff have done. The Senator and I are old friends, and I know he is one of the most zealous advocates for government oversight and reform in the Senate. I am aware of the many years of hard work he has put into this legislation.

I believe we share the same goal of ensuring that inspectors general across the Federal Government have the authorities and support they need to do their vital work on behalf of the American people. At the same time, I have serious concerns about a few aspects of this regulation as written.

I have been working with the Senator from Iowa. I wish to continue working with him.

To tell you the truth, I say to my friend from Iowa, I don't know why we cannot reach agreement. What we are really talking about are a few words. For example, this legislation would substitute the words "under the nominal supervision of the head of the establishment involved"—that takes the place of the wording "under the general supervision of the establishment involved." I say to my friend from Iowa, what springs to mind is, why

would we want to change that wording unless there was some intent to do so? Isn't the "general supervision of the establishment involved"—we have to have "under the nominal supervision"? What is this wordsmithing stuff that, frankly, I can only assume has some underlying purpose? Why would you want to substitute "under the nominal supervision" for "under the general supervision" without some reason? I don't get it. There is no explanation for why this change is necessary. It is unclear what "nominal supervision" means. If "nominal" means literally "in name only"—that is what "nominal" means—then it would remove the IG from the supervisory authority of the agency or department head.

The legislation would impose further restrictions on the ability of the Secretary of Defense—which is the area of my responsibility—to supervise and support the inspector general of the Department of Defense, so it is a reach too far.

The legislation would also restrict the President from placing an inspector general in an involuntary nonduty status, either paid or not paid, except as narrowly defined, for cause. This is likely an unconstitutional restriction on the authority of the President, who has the authority to appoint and to remove his or her own appointees. Constitutionally appointed officers serve at the pleasure of the President. Constitutionally appointed officers serve at the pleasure of the President, some subject to advice and consent of the Senate, some not. In other words, us saying what a Member of Congress can do to put someone on nonduty status is not the responsibility or the authority of the Congress of the United States.

It would limit the President's authority to place an inspector general in an involuntary, paid or unpaid, nonduty status for more than 14 days, unless the Integrity Committee of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, a well-known organization, submits to the President a written recommendation for additional time, which is acted upon by the President, and the decision is communicated immediately to both Houses of Congress. That is a further restriction on Presidential power by a committee of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency—by the way, an organization whose existence I was unaware of.

The people expect the President to have both control and responsibility over employees and officers in the executive branch, subject to advice and consent—the constitutional authorities of the Senate of the United States. It is clearly outlined in the Constitution.

The people expect the President to have both control and responsibility over employees and officers in the executive branch. The Founders believed that this design ensured effective government but, most importantly, protected our liberty from rogue government agents who might accrue vast

power but be responsive and responsible to no elected, accountable authority. We just saw a dramatic example of that, as I know my colleague from Iowa understands, in the Dodd-Frank legislation, which created agencies of government that have no accountability whatsoever, even to the appropriations process.

The legislation would also undermine congressional oversight of the IGs. For example, with this language, a congressional investigation conducted by committees into complaints that the IG has violated whistleblower protections could be labeled as "interfering with the independence of the IG" if the committee is communicating with an agency or department as part of that investigation.

While I appreciate the effort to provide exemptions to the Department of Defense from this legislation, that exemption only relates to certain subsections and sentences of the overall Inspector General Act. Thus, many of these new rules and requirements would apply to the Department of Defense. For example, the new "timely access to information" requirement is included in the legislation, but there is no exemption for DOD from that requirement. It is unclear that existing exemptions would apply.

The Senate Armed Services Committee conducts a regular, stringent oversight of the Department of Defense, including its inspector general. The committee and the Congress pass defense legislation on an annual basis, and this will be the 55th year we will do so. I do not believe there is any problem at present in the DOD IG that requires the solution this legislation would require, and in the event the Senate Armed Services Committee uncovers problems in the course of our oversight work, we will address those issues in our annual authorization legislation.

Look, I have great affection for my friend from Iowa. It is obvious that this issue is important to him. It is obvious he has been working on it for years. If I could make a suggestion to my friend from Iowa, let's set a time tomorrow to sit down with our staffs, find out what the problem is, see if we can get it resolved, and then that will give us 24 hours to try to resolve these issues.

I understand what the Senator from Iowa is seeking and trying to do. I support the intent of that legislation. My responsibilities are oversight of the Department of Defense, the largest part of our government, and I have these concerns about it. I believe we can resolve these problems maybe with a face-to-face with our staffs's engagement.

For all those reasons, I regret to tell my friend from Iowa that I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I knew ahead of time that we would have

this objection. The only difference between this objection this time and a year ago is the fact that a year ago we worked out differences with other committees of the Congress and had, evidently, 99 Senators ready to pass this bill, except for Senator REID. So it is disappointing that when we work out one problem we had a year ago, that now we have serious objections, very numerous, as it worked out, considering the fact that the committee of jurisdiction—Senator JOHNSON is chair of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, passing this bill out unanimously, getting it cleared on both sides a year ago, except for Senator REID, and now all these other problems come up.

It is impossible for me to respond to all the problems that have been presented by the Senator from Arizona. Obviously, the legislative process does emphasize cooperation between Members when there are differences, but I believe that it is probably going to be impossible this year for us to work out those differences. So I will be prepared to come back next year and pursue this legislation again and see what we can do.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, could I just say to my friend from Iowa that I am willing to maybe have a sit-down sometime in the next 24 hours to see if we can get this done.

Mr. GRASSLEY. OK. I will take that under advisement.

I would simply close with further evidence of the importance of this legislation and try to respond to what the Senator from Arizona said about its impact on the Defense Department.

Section 8 of the IG Act already contains an exception that allows the Secretary of Defense to prohibit the inspector general from conducting an investigation and gathering documents to protect national security. The exception is broad. The Secretary may block an IG investigation if it is necessary to preserve the national security interests of the United States and if the information the IG has requested concerns sensitive operation plans, intelligence matters, counterintelligence matters, ongoing criminal investigations, and other matters that would constitute a serious threat to national security if disclosed.

In addition, cosponsors and I worked with the Committee on Armed Services last year to ensure that the bill makes the Secretary of Defense's authority to restrict certain types of sensitive information even more clear than it was in the 1978 legislation. After we made those changes, Senator MCCAIN, as I have already said, cleared this version of the access language last year.

I guess at this point I am going to yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TENNESSEE TRAGEDIES

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise today to express my deepest sympathies and offer steadfast support to the countless Tennesseans who have experienced tragedy in the recent days.

It has been a rough few weeks in our great State. Last week, my hometown of Chattanooga lost six young children in a tragic schoolbus crash. Today, countless East Tennesseans face a long road ahead after severe storms and tornadoes ripped through southeast Tennessee, leaving tremendous damage and taking the lives of two individuals in Polk County.

Tomorrow morning, I will be in another area of our State that is dealing with unimaginable tragedy. As you have likely seen by now, the damage caused by wildfires in Sevier County, the place where my wife was raised, is heartbreaking. While officials continue to assess the full extent of the damage, we know that many have suffered tremendous loss. As of this morning, officials confirmed that they are still addressing the remnants of smoldering wildfires. More than 400 firefighters are supporting the effort. The exact number of structures affected remains unknown, but local officials are estimating 700 impacted structures and more than 17,000 acres burned. More than 200 individuals remain in shelters, and just moments ago, we learned that 10 fatalities have been confirmed.

Sevier County is a special place, surrounded by some of the country's most beautiful God-given amenities. Millions of people from around the world visit each year and have built memories in this treasured community. But as the mayor of Gatlinburg noted earlier today, "it's not the attractions or the restaurants that make this place special, it's the people" who live there.

So many wonderful families call Sevier County home—tough, proud people whose roots in the area span generations.

Those who know the area and these people are not at all surprised by the community response. The Nation has watched and read countless stories of selfless individuals—many who lost everything themselves—helping others. We have watched the mayor and city manager of Gatlinburg, both of whom lost their own homes, provide steadfast strength and grace. We have watched the Sevier County mayor close each press conference with a simple request: "Pray for us."

The coming days, weeks, and months will not be easy. The recovery will take time. We are committed to doing everything that we all can do to help you rebuild. The support does not end when the cameras leave. Governor Haslam, Senator ALEXANDER, Congressman ROE, and I are ready to support requests for assistance for the recovery efforts. People throughout Tennessee and across the Nation will be back to visit very soon. Of course, as has been requested, we will continue to pray.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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.

WORLD AIDS DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss World AIDS Day. Thirty years ago, the National Academy of Sciences's Institute of Medicine issued a report calling for a "massive media, educational and public health campaign to curb the spread of the HIV infection." The global community heeded that call and today, on World AIDS Day, we celebrate progress that we have made in treating and preventing HIV/AIDS both at home and abroad and recommit ourselves to creating an AIDS-free generation.

Earlier this year, I had the opportunity to visit an HIV/AIDS clinic in Namibia supported by the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, PEPFAR, and the Global Fund. While there, I met a 30-year-old man named Simon who said he would not be alive without the international community's HIV/AIDS assistance. While the individual stories of people like Simon are a testament to the hard-fought progress this global response has achieved, the aggregate impact of our efforts cannot be understated. PEPFAR has been a bipartisan success story that began with a strong commitment by President George W. Bush and grew under President Obama. It must continue to have broad-based support in a Trump administration and in the 115th Congress, so we can keep making inroads against this pernicious disease.

Since 2005, AIDS-related deaths have fallen by 45 percent globally. In Africa, new HIV infections have declined 14 percent since 2010, including a 66 percent reduction in new infections in children in the region. And today, 18.2 million men, women, and children worldwide are on antiretroviral therapy, double the number of people who had access just 5 years ago.

Nevertheless, there remains more work to be done. In my home State of Maryland, there were 1,334 new HIV diagnoses in 2015, ranking it the third highest adult HIV diagnosis rate per capita in the country. And globally, we are seeing data that indicates that

AIDS-related deaths are actually increasing among adolescents. At home and abroad, such trends are troubling.

We therefore cannot rest on our laurels. The United States must continue to lead this global fight. Through strong funding for PEPFAR and multilateral organizations like the Global Fund, we will ensure the continued commitment and leadership of partner countries reinforced with support from donor nations, civil society, and people living with HIV, faith-based organizations, the private sector, and foundations. And at here at home, we must ensure that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, the National Institutes of Health, NIH, the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program, and our State, local, and community partners have the resources they need to continue making significant progress to prevent, treat, and eventually cure this disease.

With our work cut out for us and the memories of far too many loved ones in our hearts, we strive on this World AIDS Day as an international community toward a world free of HIV/AIDS and recommit to mobilize the resources needed for treatment, to summon the compassion and understanding to prevent stigma, and to unleash our collective ingenuity and persistence in search of a cure.

REMEMBERING BISHOP EMERSON COLAW

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to remember a dear friend, Bishop Emerson Colaw, a devoted and widely respected leader of the United Methodist Church. Bishop Colaw passed away on October 11, 2016, at the age of 94 in Ohio, where he lived during the final years of his life.

Emerson Stephen Colaw was born November 13, 1921, in Chanute, KS, and moved to Cincinnati at the age of 16 to attend God's Bible School and College. A committed student, Colaw went on to earn a B.S. degree in 1944 from the University of Cincinnati, a bachelor of divinity, magna cum laude, in 1947 from Drew Theological Seminary, and a master of arts in 1953 from Northwestern University in Evanston, IL. He also received honorary doctorates from five different institutions.

Remembered as a strong preacher and compassionate leader who loved the church and had a heart for the clergy, Colaw served as a mentor and role model of Christian discipleship for colleagues, congregants, friends, and family. He began his ministry as a clergyperson for the United Methodist Church serving the New York Annual Conference and the Northern Illinois Annual Conference, where he served three pastorates over 14 years.

In 1961, Colaw was appointed to Hyde Park Community United Methodist Church in Cincinnati, OH, part of the West Ohio Annual Conference. During his time in Cincinnati, Colaw spent many years as the moderator of a

weekly television program titled “Dialogue” which featured area clergy from a variety of faiths.

After 19 years of service to Hyde Park Community Methodist Church, in 1980, Colaw was elected Bishop of the Minnesota Conference, where he served until retiring from the episcopacy in 1988. He went on to serve as professor of Homiletics and Christian Ministry at the United Theological Seminary in Dayton, OH, from 1988 to 1999 and was its acting president in 1995–96. He later spent winters in Florida and served as bishop-in-residence at North Naples United Methodist Church.

Emmerson and his late wife, Jane, were married more than 70 years and raised 4 children, 8 grandchildren, 12 great-grandchildren, and a great-great-granddaughter.

I would like to honor Emmerson Colaw for his contributions to the United Methodist Church, his community, and our State.

REMEMBERING JAMES “JIM” F. DICKE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to remember James “Jim” F. Dicke, a WWII veteran, an Ohio business leader, and a philanthropist. Mr. Dicke passed away on Friday, November 11, 2016, at the age of 94.

Jim Dicke was born in New York in 1922 and raised in Dayton, OH, graduating from Stivers High School in 1939. He was an honorary graduate of Culver Military Academy and was awarded an honorary DBA by Ohio Northern University. A WWII veteran, Jim served as a lieutenant instructor in the Army Air Corps.

Following his military service, Jim returned to the Dayton region and worked with his father, Carl, and other family members to found a company called Crown Controls Company, now known as Crown Equipment Corporation, which is a leading global manufacturer of material handling equipment, currently in its fourth generation of family leadership. With over 4,400 Ohio employees, the New Bremen, OH, based company has three manufacturing facilities along I-75 in west Ohio, as well as a branch in Vandalia. We are proud to have this innovative, successful, and competitive manufacturer in the Buckeye State.

In addition to being a job creator and business leader, Jim Dicke was involved in many important community activities. He was a major benefactor to Ohio Northern University, where he was given an honorary doctorate in 2000 and where there are a number of namesakes there in his honor, including James F. Dicke Hall, home to the James F. Dicke College of Business Administration, as well as the Dicke House, home of the university’s president.

Jim and his late wife, Eilleen, were married for almost 73 years and raised two sons, six grandchildren, and seven great-grandchildren.

I would like to honor James Frank Dicke for his many contributions to his community and our State.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the College of Wooster in recognition of its 150th anniversary of providing quality higher education to the citizens of Ohio. In 1865, Reverend James Reed, the minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Wooster, rallied the community to create a Presbyterian college in Wooster. On December 18, 1866, the then University of Wooster was incorporated by the Presbyterian Synod. In order to better reflect the institution’s offerings, the University of Wooster became the College of Wooster. Wooster’s first class consisted of 30 men and 4 women instructed by five faculty members; the college now enrolls over 2,000 students, representing 45 States and 44 countries, and instructed by 171 faculty members. Wooster now has more than 50 academic programs in business, the arts, humanities, and the sciences.

The mission of the College of Wooster is to create “a community of independent minds, working together to become leaders of character and influence in an interdependent global community.” Wooster accomplishes this by offering a rigorous and dynamic liberal education that focuses on mentoring, applied learning, and project based learning where students develop attributes that are valued by employers and important for developing the leaders of tomorrow. It is helping to ensure that students are prepared with the skills they need for the jobs of the 21st century. Because of this, 92 percent of Wooster graduates are either employed or in graduate school within 1 year after receiving their diplomas. We are proud to have this extraordinary independent college in Ohio.

I am here to honor the College of Wooster and to congratulate all of those who contributed to making its first 150 years such a success.

HONORING ERIC DALE ELLSWORTH

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, on Friday, November 18, 2016, Eric Ellsworth of Brigham City, UT, began his day like virtually every other day of his adult life. He put on his uniform and drove to work fully aware that it could be his last day on Earth. Eric was a State trooper with the Utah Highway Patrol, and for 7 years this is how he began each day: by summoning enough courage to last most men a lifetime.

Why did he do it?

I never had the privilege of meeting Eric. But over the past several days I have read a great deal about him, and based on the comments of his family, friends, and colleagues, I suspect the answer is that Eric wouldn’t have wanted it any other way.

Like all law enforcement officers, the life of a trooper is a life of service to

one’s community and one’s fellow man—the vulnerable, the needy, and the insecure. It is also a life of sacrifice. And on November 18, 2016—that Friday that began like all the others—Trooper Ellsworth made the ultimate sacrifice.

While directing traffic to avoid a roadway hazard along a rural stretch of State Route 13 near Garland in Box Elder County, Trooper Ellsworth was accidentally struck by a passing vehicle. For 4 days, he remained in critical condition at Intermountain Medical Center, defying the odds and fighting to live another day in that uniform. But on November 22, 2016, Eric succumbed to the injuries sustained in the crash and passed from this life into the next. He died honorably, doing what he loved—and lived—to do: helping others and serving his community.

Indeed, if you look at the trajectory of Eric’s life, you are left with the distinct impression that the man was destined, from the very start, to be a highway patrol trooper.

He was the seventh of nine children—and the eldest brother—which must have taught him at an early age what it means to live with duties and obligations toward others. And his hero—his father, Ronald Ellsworth, who was also a highway trooper—showed him what courage as a daily discipline looks like.

Like most sons who revere their dads, Eric grew up wanting to follow in his father’s footsteps. And so he served.

He served his community, as an Eagle Scout and an active member of his church, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He served his family, as a loving husband to his wife and high-school sweetheart, Janica, and a nurturing father to their three sons, Bennett, Ian, and Oliver. He served his fellow citizens and countrymen as a highway trooper who kept watch over the roads in northern Utah. And most importantly to Eric, he served his Heavenly Father, as a missionary in Winnipeg, Canada, and as a faithful witness of Jesus Christ.

At 31 years of age, Trooper Ellsworth’s life was cut tragically short. But in those 31 years, he did more to help his fellow man than most of us can hope to accomplish in a lifetime. He lived a full and bighearted life, always ready to answer the call of service and dedicated to making the world not just safer but better for everyone.

This is Eric Ellsworth’s legacy, his gift to the world, and his sons’ greatest inheritance: the enduring example of a life well lived.

May he rest in peace, and may God bless his family and the community he served—it will never be the same without him.

Thank you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

IDAHO HOMETOWN HERO MEDAL

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the 2016 Idaho Hometown Hero medalists.

Drs. Fahim and Naeem Rahim established the Idaho Hometown Hero medal in 2011 to recognize outstanding Idahoans working for the betterment of our communities. Medalists are selected from nominations sought from the public throughout the State and must meet criteria that include being dedicated to hard work, self-improvement, and community service.

In this 6th year of the presentation of this honor, 10 Idahoans from communities across Idaho are 2016 Hometown Hero medal recipients. Executive Director of Suicide Prevention Action Network of Idaho Jeni Griffin of Idaho Falls is recognized for her dedication of more than 10 years to promoting suicide prevention in Idaho. Nationally recognized teacher, coach, and mentor Holly Kartchner of Blackfoot received the award for her commitment to education in southeastern Idaho, leading her students to reach national championships. Former Coeur d'Alene police officer and Air Force veteran Mike Kralicek is honored for the inspiration he provides to other public servants to be better prepared for overcoming adversity and his leadership in helping law enforcement families in times of crisis.

Idaho Falls attorney Doug Nelson is recognized for dedicating more than three decades to leading, supporting, and advocating for children's activity programs and multiple charitable organizations and mentoring disadvantaged single mothers. Wiley Petersen, a professional bullrider, coach, motivational speaker, and mentor who grew up in Fort Hall received the medal for his efforts to give back to his Native American community and help further the progress of the Native American people. Sonya Rosario, a filmmaker from Meridian and the founder and executive director of Women of Color Alliance, is honored for her work and films to help heal Native communities. Zeze Rwasama of Twin Falls, who is originally from Congo, is the director of the College of Southern Idaho's refugee program, and is recognized for his work to educate, integrate and build bridges between refugees and their new communities.

Tyvan Schmitt, of Pocatello, who served in the U.S. Navy, is a posthumous awardee for his bravery and courage as he attempted to prevent a large catastrophe and for his devotion to helping the homeless, the schools, and neighbors. Linda Scott, a Pocatello native who served in the U.S. Army, is recognized for her volunteer efforts and commitment of her time, energy, resources, and compassion to helping others in need. Pocatello resident and Spanish professor Dr. Helen Cathleen Tarp is recognized for her work as founding program director of the Spanish for Health Professions major at Idaho State University, which is the only major of its kind in the country.

These remarkable Idahoans are among the 56 Idahoans of diverse backgrounds and a wide range of ages who

have been honored as Hometown Hero Award recipients since the award's establishment. I commend the Rahims, the award's committee members, the cosponsors, volunteers, and other organizations supporting this honor for their work to shed light on extraordinary service in our communities.

These Hometown Hero award recipients and countless other Idahoans lead by example, inspiring others to go above and beyond in assisting others and improving our communities. Congratulations to the 2016 Hometown Hero award recipients on your achievements, and thank you for your efforts to better our communities.●

TRIBUTE TO ROYCE PERRETT

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week, I have the distinct honor of recognizing Royce Perrett of Wibaux County, a true American cowboy, who will celebrate his 93rd birthday this weekend. While ranching has been his profession for most of his life, he is also a Navy veteran, a devoted husband of over 70 years, a father of three children, and a valued member of the ranching community between Sidney and Wibaux.

Growing up in rural Nebraska, Mr. Perrett made do without many of the modern comforts we enjoy today: electricity, refrigeration, and modern transportation. When courting Nell Anderson, who would later become his wife, he traveled 10 miles by horse on the weekend to spend time with her, and on his way home Sunday night, he would sleep on his horse, waking up when the horse would stop to open gates.

After WWII and his service in the Navy was completed, Mr. Perrett returned to doing what he loves: ranching. His pursuits took him and his family from the Sandhills of Nebraska, to Isabel, SD, and then in his early 60s, when most would be considering retirement, Mr. Perrett came to Montana to manage the Blue Mountain Ranch, a 13,000-acre ranch north of Wibaux. While Mr. Perrett has had to trade in his saddle for a seat in a side-by-side ATV in recent years, he still manages the Blue Mountain Ranch full time for Gartner-Denowh Angus Ranch and puts in long hours fixing fences, checking water, and watching over 500 cows that graze there in the summer and fall.

When he isn't busy working, he enjoys collecting Western memorabilia and sharing his many stories about ranching, his life adventures, and his self-described greatest achievement: his marriage of over 70 years. As I found out recently when I stopped to visit Mr. Perrett, his door is always open to visitors and you had better be ready for a good conversation and his-
tory lesson if you stop by.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 34) to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 4419. An act to update the financial disclosure requirements for judges of the District of Columbia courts and to make other improvements to the District of Columbia courts.

H.R. 5785. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for an annuity supplement for certain air traffic controllers.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 1:37 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 1555. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 2234. An act to award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the members of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in recognition of their superior service and major contributions during World War II.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2992. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the U.S. Merchant Marine of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

H.R. 5047. An act to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Labor to provide information to veterans and members of the Armed Forces about articulation agreements between institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5384. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5948. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 830 Kuhn Drive in Chula Vista, California, as the "Jonathan 'J.D.' De Guzman Post Office Building".

H.R. 6009. An act to ensure the effective processing of mail by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6138. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 560 East Pleasant Valley Road, Port Hueneme, California, as the U.S. Naval Construction Battalion "Seabees" Fallen Heroes Post Office Building.

H.R. 6186. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain protections against prohibited personnel practices, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6282. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2024 Jerome Avenue, in Bronx, New York, as the “Dr. Roscoe C. Brown, Jr. Post Office Building”.

H.R. 6302. An act to provide an increase in premium pay for United States Secret Service agents performing protective services during 2016, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6303. An act to designate facilities of the United States Postal Service, to establish new ZIP Codes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6304. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 501 North Main Street in Florence, Arizona, as the “Adolfo ‘Harpo’ Celaya Post Office”.

H.R. 6393. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 174. Concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 34.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-7767. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 29, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7768. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 29, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7769. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Clarifications and Revisions to Military Aircraft, Gas Turbine Engines and Related Items License Requirements” (RIN0694-AG76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7770. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility; Massachusetts: Marshfield, Town of, Plymouth County” ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2016-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7771. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on

the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7772. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a final report on the national emergency with respect to Burma that was declared in Executive Order 13047 of May 20, 1997; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7773. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was originally declared in Executive Order 13611 on May 16, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7774. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision of the FDIC’s Freedom of Information Act Regulations” (RIN3064-AE53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 29, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7775. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment” (RIN3133-AE59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7776. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Prepaid Accounts Under the electronic Fund Transfer Act (Regulation E) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)” (RIN3170-AA22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7777. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was originally declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7778. A communication from the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department’s proposal to accept a 3,323-acre donation from the American River Conservancy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-7779. A communication from the Counsel to the Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Resource Agency Hearings and Alternatives Development Procedures in Hydropower Licenses” (RIN0596-AC42; RIN1090-AA91; RIN0648-AU01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 29, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-7780. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision of Certain Federal Water Quality Criteria Applicable to Washington” ((RIN2040-AF56) (FRL No. 9955-40-OW)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7781. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System General Permit Remand Rule” ((RIN2040-AF57) (FRL No. 9955-11-OW)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7782. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Quality Plans; Tennessee; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard” (FRL No. 9955-58-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7783. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval: AK; Permitting Fees Revision” (FRL No. 9955-48-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7784. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; MA; Decommissioning of Stage II Vapor Recovery Systems” (FRL No. 9950-92-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7785. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “2015 Revision and Confidentiality Determinations for Data Elements Under the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule” ((RIN2060-AS60) (FRL No. 9954-42-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7786. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Oil and Gas Extraction Point Source Category—Implementation Date Extension” ((RIN2040-AF68) (FRL No. 9955-65-OW)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-7787. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Recovery Auditing in Medicare Fee-for-Service for Fiscal Year 2015”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7788. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revised Medical Criteria for Evaluating Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Infection and for Evaluating Functional Limitations in Immune System Disorders” (RIN0960-AG71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7789. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Corrections and Clarifications” (RIN1400-AE05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7790. A communication from the Supervisory Management and Program Analyst, Office of Acquisition and Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Requirement for Non-discrimination against End-Users of Supplies or Services ('Beneficiaries') under USAID-Funded Contracts" (RIN0412-AA81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-7791. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indirect Food Additives: Paper and Paperboard Components" (Docket No. FDA-2016-F-1153) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7792. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Gas Containers and Closures; Current Good Manufacturing Practice Requirements" ((RIN0910-AC53) (Docket No. FDA-2005-N-0343)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7793. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Uniform Compliance Date for Food Labeling Regulations" (Docket No. FDA-2000-N-0011) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7794. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food and Drug Administration Review and Action on Over-the-Counter Time and Extent Applications" ((RIN0910-AH30) (Docket No. FDA-2016-N-0543)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7795. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of assets in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Benefits and Assets; Expected Retirement Age" (29 CFR Part 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7796. A communication from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report from the Office of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7797. A communication from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Endowment's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7798. A communication from the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General

and the Chairman's Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7799. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Career and Career-Conditional Employment" (RIN3206-AM64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7800. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Veterans' Preference" (RIN3206-AM79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7801. A communication from the Acting Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Employees' Health Benefits Program Coverage for Certain Firefighters and Intermittent Emergency Response Personnel" (RIN3206-AM66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 28, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7802. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Energy's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7803. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense Agency Financial Report (AFR) for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7804. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Veterans Affairs' Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7805. A communication from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Endowment's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7806. A communication from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7807. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7808. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7809. A communication from the Administrator, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's annual financial audit and management report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7810. A communication from the Chairwoman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2016 Agency Financial Report and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7811. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Energy's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7812. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the period of April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation's response; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7813. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Administration's fiscal year 2016 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7814. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Corporation for National and Community Service's Response and Report on Final Action for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7815. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7816. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Transportation's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7817. A communication from the Federal Co-Chair, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7818. A communication from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7819. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-7820. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2015 Outcome Evaluations of Administration for Native Americans (ANA) Projects Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-7821. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting,

pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 Report to Congress on Contract Funding of Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act Awards"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-7822. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2012 Report to Congress on Administration of the Tribal Self-Governance Program"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-7823. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2013 Report to Congress on Administration of the Tribal Self-Governance Program"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-7824. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2014 Report to Congress on Administration of the Tribal Self-Governance Program"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-7825. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner, Administration on Native Americans, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2016; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-7826. A communication from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's 2016-2020 Strategic Plan; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7827. A communication from the Executive Director, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's 2016-2020 Strategic Plan; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7828. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy for the position of Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, Department of Transportation, received in the office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7829. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protecting the Privacy of Customers of Broadband and Other Telecommunications Services" (FCC 16-148) (WC Docket No. 16-106) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7830. A communication from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Connect America Fund" (FCC 16-143) (WC Docket No. 16-90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 30, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-256. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana re-

questing the United States Congress to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution concerning imposition of fiscal restraints on the federal government, limitations of the powers and jurisdiction of federal powers, and the limitation of the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 14

Section 1. The legislature of the State of Indiana hereby applies to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States that impose fiscal restraints of the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress.

Section 2. The secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit copies of this application to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate and to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and copies to the members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State; also to transmit copies hereof to the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the several States, requesting their cooperation.

Section 3. This application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the several States have made applications on the same subject.

POM-257. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to a proposed amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3084. A bill to invest in innovation through research and development, and to improve the competitiveness of the United States (Rept. No. 114-389).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2201. A bill to promote international trade, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Robert N. Polumbo, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Jerry D. Harris, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. James M. Holmes, to be General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. William K. Lescher, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Kelly A. Aeschbach, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Dixon R. Smith, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Joel E. DeGroot and ending with Col. David D. Zwart, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. David P. Baczewski and ending with Brig. Gen. Roger E. Williams, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Jesse T. Simmons, Jr., to be Major General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. David M. McMinn and ending with Brig. Gen. Ronald E. Paul, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Air Force nomination of Col. William E. Dickens, Jr., to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Brian K. Borgen and ending with Col. Constance M. Von Hoffman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Randolph J. Staudenraus, to be Major General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Craig L. LaFave and ending with Brig. Gen. Patrick M. Wade, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Air Force nomination of Col. Stephen C. Melton, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Paul E. Funk II, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Gary J. Volesky, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. James H. Dickinson, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Patrick M. Hamilton, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Benjamin F. Adams III and ending with Brig. Gen. Michael R. Zerbonia, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Army nomination of Col. Mark A. Pitera, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Ellis F. Hopkins III, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Michael A. Abell and ending with Col. Louis W. Wilham, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Mary M. Jackson, to be Vice Admiral.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Daniel J. Bessmer and ending with Christie Barton Walton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 16, 2016.

Air Force nominations beginning with Kip T. Averett and ending with Daniel S. Walker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Air Force nominations beginning with Shawn M. Garcia and ending with Morgan H. Laird, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Air Force nominations beginning with Daniel C. Abell and ending with Peter Zwart, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Air Force nomination of Gary A. Fairchild, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Megan M. Luka, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brandon D. Clint and ending with Edmund J. Rutherford, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Air Force nominations beginning with Isamettin A. Aral and ending with Leslie Ann Zyzda-Martin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Army nomination of Brian C. Garver, to be Major.

Army nomination of Clifford D. Johnston, to be Major.

Army nomination of Reinaldo Gonzalez II, to be Major.

Army nomination of Graham F. Inman, to be Major.

Army nomination of Eileen K. Jenkins, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Jeffrey M. Farris, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Matthew T. Bell, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Melissa B. Reister, to be Major.

Army nomination of Charles M. Causey, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Stephen A. Labate and ending with Raymond J. Orr, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Army nomination of Roxanne E. Wallace, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Eric A. Mitchell, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jonathan J. Vannatta, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Dennis D. Calloway, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Kenneth L. Alford and ending with Bruce T. Sidebotham, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Army nomination of Henry Spring, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Craig A. Yunker, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Cornelius J. Pope, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Anthony K. McConnell, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Jennifer L. Cummings, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Donald J. Erpenbach and ending with Timothy A. Fanter, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Army nomination of Carl I. Shaia, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Lisa M. Barden, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Roger D. Lyles, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Clara A. Bieganek, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Isaiah M. Garfias, to be Major.

Army nomination of Louis E. Herrera, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Schnicka L. Singleton, to be Major.

Army nomination of John R. Burchfield, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Elizabeth S. Eatonferenzi, to be Major.

Army nomination of Richard D. Mina, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Temidayo L. Anderson and ending with D0127914, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Army nomination of Richard A. Gautier, Jr., to be Major.

Army nomination of Joseph A. Papenfus, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Stuart G. Baker and ending with Walter D. Venneman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Army nomination of David S. Yuen, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Donta A. White, to be Major.

Army nomination of Tony A. Hampton, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Charles C. Anderson and ending with James D. Willson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Army nomination of David A. Yasenchock, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Aaron C. Ramiro, to be Major.

Army nomination of Richard M. Strong, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Brendon S. Baker, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Lanny J. Acosta, Jr. and ending with Lance B. Turlington, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Army nomination of Andrew J. Wade, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Christopher S. Besser, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Chad C. Black, to be Major.

Army nomination of Thomas D. Starkey, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Joshua D. Fitzgarrald, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Anthony C. Lyons, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nomination of Suzanne L. Hopkins, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Jafar A. Ali and ending with Anthony K. Wolverton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Navy nomination of Meryl A. Severson III, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Ashley R. Bjorklund, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Adeleke O. Mowobi, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Mary K. Arbutnot and ending with John K. Werner, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on November 15, 2016.

Navy nomination of Stephen W. Hedrick, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Vincent M. J. Ambrosino, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Neal P. Ridge, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Abdeslam Bousalham, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Scott M. Morey, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Christian R. Foschi, to be Lieutenant Commander.

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on Finance.

*Charles P. Blahous, III, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

*Charles P. Blahous, III, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

*Charles P. Blahous, III, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

*Robert D. Reischauer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

*Robert D. Reischauer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

*Robert D. Reischauer, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 7. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the removal of the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare program with respect to speech generating devices; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 8. A bill to provide for the approval of the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Norway Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 9. A bill to provide for the regulation of over-the-counter hearing aids; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 10. A bill to provide for the consideration of a definition of anti-Semitism for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities; considered and passed.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3489. A bill to prohibit a court from awarding damages based on race, ethnicity, gender, religion, or actual or perceived sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3490. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may require that the United States Postal Service obtain a signature

from that person in order to deliver the document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HETTKAMP, and Mr. REED):

S. 3491. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to provide justice to victims of fraud; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 3492. A bill to designate the Traverse City VA Community-Based Outpatient Clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Traverse City, Michigan, as the "Colonel Demas T. Craw VA Clinic"; considered and passed.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3493. A bill to revise the boundaries of certain John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System units in New Jersey; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. Res. 627. A resolution designating December 3, 2016, as "National Phenylketonuria Awareness Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUNT:

S. Res. 628. A resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 290

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 290, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 497

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) 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. 1490

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1490, a bill to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes.

S. 1794

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 1794, a bill to prohibit drilling in the Arctic Ocean.

S. 2208

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, a bill to promote the economic security and safety of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and for other purposes.

S. 2577

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2577, a bill to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA and other forensic evidence samples to improve and expand the forensic science testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of forensic evidence, to provide post-conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to support accreditation efforts of forensic science laboratories and medical examiner offices, to address training and equipment needs, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes.

S. 2645

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2645, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2671

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2671, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish rules for payment for graduate medical education (GME) costs for hospitals that establish a new medical residency training program after hosting resident rotators for short durations.

S. 2868

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2868, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deferral of inclusion in gross income for capital gains reinvested in economically distressed zones.

S. 2878

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2878, a bill to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to improve the ability of the United States to advance religious freedom globally through enhanced diplomacy, training, counterterrorism, and foreign assistance efforts, and through strong-

er and more flexible political responses to religious freedom violations and violent extremism worldwide, and for other purposes.

S. 2989

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2989, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 3111

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3111, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the 7.5 percent threshold for the medical expense deduction for individuals age 65 or older.

S. 3164

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3164, a bill to provide protection for survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault under the Fair Housing Act.

S. 3299

At the request of Mr. DAINES, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3299, a bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to notify air carriers and security screening personnel of the Transportation Security Administration regarding permitting baby formula, breast milk, and juice on aircraft, and for other purposes.

S. 3373

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3373, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to ensure that the reciprocal deposits of an insured depository institution are not considered to be funds obtained by or through a deposit broker, and for other purposes.

S. 3391

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3391, a bill to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act.

S. 3447

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 3447, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to place in Arlington National Cemetery a memorial honoring the helicopter pilots and crew members of the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 3472

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 3472, a bill to require the Bureau of

the Census to conduct a survey to determine income and poverty levels in the United States in a manner that accounts for the receipt of Federal means-tested benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 3476

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3476, a bill to waive recoupment by the United States of certain bonuses and similar benefits erroneously received by members of the Army National Guard, and for other purposes.

S. 3478

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3478, a bill to require continued and enhanced annual reporting to Congress in the Annual Report on International Religious Freedom on anti-Semitic incidents in Europe, the safety and security of European Jewish communities, and the efforts of the United States to partner with European governments, the European Union, and civil society groups, to combat anti-Semitism, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 51

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 51, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those who served in the bays, harbors, and territorial seas of the Republic of Vietnam during the period beginning on January 9, 1962, and ending on May 7, 1975, should be presumed to have been exposed to the toxin Agent Orange and should be eligible for all related Federal benefits that come with such presumption under the Agent Orange Act of 1991.

S. CON. RES. 56

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 56, a concurrent resolution clarifying any potential misunderstanding as to whether actions taken by President-elect Donald Trump constitute a violation of the Emoluments Clause, and calling on President-elect Trump to divest his interest in, and sever his relationship to, the Trump Organization.

S. RES. 580

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 580, a resolution supporting the establishment of a President's Youth Council.

S. RES. 616

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 616, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Diabetes Month.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. REED):

S. 3491. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to provide justice to victims of fraud; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Fair Calculations in Civil Damages Act of 2016, also known as the Fair Calculations Act. This critical civil rights legislation would ensure that Federal judicial awards of civil damages do not value women and minorities less than other Americans. By combating discrimination in the award of civil damages, the Fair Calculations Act would help bring our nation one step closer to fulfilling the promise of equal justice under law. I thank Senator GILLIBRAND for her support, and I am proud she is an original cosponsor of this bill. I also thank Rep. KENNEDY, who is introducing the House companion to this bill, for his leadership.

A basic tenet of the American legal system is our shared belief that "all men are created equal," an idea so critical to who we are and what we believe that it is explicitly reflected in our Declaration of Independence. Even our national charter reflects the idea that everyone must be given equal protection under the laws. Out of this constitutional foundation lays a simple truth: to be equal under the law means, at a minimum, that neither our government nor the rule of the law should discriminate against anyone by virtue of his or her membership in a group.

Sadly, our Nation fails to live up to those promises when courts award damages in civil cases. Far too often, Federal and State judges use race or gender as factors to weigh when deciding how much money to award a plaintiff in a civil case. As a result, individuals of a certain race or gender often receive larger awards than people of a different race or gender, even in similar cases. This damages awards gap derives from estimates of how much money an individual would have earned over their lifetimes had they not been injured and, far too often, that estimate considers earnings and job levels by race and gender.

Consider the case of James McMillan, an African-American man who was injured during the 2003 Staten Island ferry crash. As a result of the crash, Mr. McMillan suffered a severe spinal cord injury that caused him to need medical care for the remainder of his life. He sued the City of New York. In response to his suit, the City of New York argued that he should receive less money for his injury because data demonstrated that African-American vic-

tims of spinal cord injuries lived fewer years than white victims and, therefore, he would incur fewer medical costs. Fortunately, the judge in that case rejected the city's argument. But no American should have to endure the indignity of having the value of their life determined by their race or gender.

The use of race and gender to project future earnings in courts is a widespread problem. According to a 2009 survey by the National Association of Forensic Economics, 44 percent of forensic economists reported considering race and 92 percent reported considering gender when estimating future earning rates for injured children.

Even leading scholars have been critical of this practice. Martha Chamallas, a law professor at the Ohio State University Law School, called the practice reminiscent of something "civil rights advocates [fought] in the 1960s." Jennifer Wiggins, a law professor at the University of Maine Law School, has emphasized that the practice "reinforces past discrimination and pushes it out into the future and endorses." I could not agree more.

The Fair Calculations Act, which I introduce today, would bar Federal courts from awarding damages based on race, ethnicity, gender, religion, or actual or perceived sexual orientation. Justice in an American court should not turn on race or gender, and the time has come to put an end to this discriminatory practice in Federal courts. I also believe this bill would serve as a road map for States who I hope will end this discriminatory practice in their courts.

The legislation would require the Department of Justice and the Department of Labor to develop guidance to the States on how calculations of future earnings for a violation of State tort law could violate Federal equal protection laws. That is yet another example of how this bill aims to persuade states to follow our lead. By issuing guidance to the states on this issue, the impact of this bill has the potential to be even more far-reaching.

The bill would require the Department of Labor to issue guidance to forensic economists on how to create inclusive future earnings tables that do not rely on race, ethnicity, gender, religion, or actual or perceived sexual orientation. Forensic economists are often used as experts in both Federal and State courts to advise lawyers and judges on the proper amounts to award for damages. Instructing these experts on the benefits of more representative future earnings tables and the legal hurdles of using less inclusive earning tables is yet another way to ensure that future earnings in State courts do not harm women or minorities.

Finally, the Fair Calculations Act would direct the Judicial Conference of the United States to conduct a study and report to Congress on the use of race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, or actual or perceived sexual orientation in the calculation of future earnings in civil court cases. This provision

provides for more transparency and record keeping. The first step to fixing a problem is understanding the extent of the problem you have, and this provision allows for Congress to track the extent of Federal judicial awards based on demographics. It also allows for more open government, which is important because transparency allows the American people to hold its government accountable.

Our Nation was founded on the idea that all people are created equal. Valuing one person's life more than another merely because of the color of their skin or sex belies this core value that makes our Nation great. The Fair Calculations Act would remedy this wrong and continue our country down the path towards fulfilling our Nation's promise of liberty and justice for all. I am proud to stand here today and introduce this critical bill and I urge its speedy passage.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 627—DESIGNATING DECEMBER 3, 2016, AS “NATIONAL PHENYLKETONURIA AWARENESS DAY”

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 627

Whereas phenylketonuria (in this preamble referred to as “PKU”) is a rare, inherited metabolic disorder that is characterized by the inability of the body to process the essential amino acid phenylalanine and which causes intellectual disability and other neurological problems, such as memory loss and mood disorders, when treatment is not started within the first few weeks of life;

Whereas PKU is also referred to as Phenylalanine Hydroxylase Deficiency;

Whereas newborn screening for PKU was initiated in the United States in 1963 and was recommended for inclusion in State newborn screening programs under the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-204);

Whereas approximately 1 out of every 15,000 infants in the United States is born with PKU;

Whereas PKU is treated with medical food; Whereas the 2012 Phenylketonuria Scientific Review Conference affirmed the recommendation of lifelong dietary treatment for PKU made by the National Institutes of Health Consensus Development Conference Statement 2000;

Whereas, in 2014, the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and Genetic Metabolic Dieticians International published medical and dietary guidelines on the optimal treatment of PKU;

Whereas medical foods are medically necessary for children and adults living with PKU;

Whereas adults with PKU who discontinue treatment are at risk for serious medical issues, such as depression, impulse control disorder, phobias, tremors, and pareses;

Whereas women with PKU must maintain strict metabolic control before and during pregnancy to prevent fetal damage;

Whereas children born from untreated mothers with PKU may have a condition

known as “maternal phenylketonuria syndrome”, which can cause small brains, intellectual disabilities, birth defects of the heart, and low birth weights;

Whereas, although there is no cure for PKU, treatment involving medical foods, medications, and restriction of phenylalanine intake can prevent progressive, irreversible brain damage;

Whereas access to health insurance coverage for medical food varies across the United States and the long-term costs associated with caring for untreated children and adults with PKU far exceed the cost of providing medical food treatment;

Whereas gaps in medical foods coverage has a detrimental impact on individuals with PKU, their families, and society;

Whereas scientists and researchers are hopeful that breakthroughs in PKU research will be forthcoming;

Whereas researchers across the United States are conducting important research projects involving PKU; and

Whereas the Senate is an institution that can raise awareness of PKU among the general public and the medical community; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates December 3, 2016, as “National Phenylketonuria Awareness Day”;

(2) encourages all people in the United States to become more informed about phenylketonuria and the role of medical foods in treating phenylketonuria; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the National PKU Alliance, a nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the lives of individuals with phenylketonuria.

SENATE RESOLUTION 628—AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A REVISED EDITION OF THE SENATE RULES AND MANUAL

Mr. BLUNT submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 628

Resolved, That—

(1) the Committee on Rules and Administration shall prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the 114th Congress;

(2) the manual shall be printed as a Senate document; and

(3) in addition to the usual number of copies, 1,500 copies of the manual shall be bound, of which—

(A) 500 paperbound copies shall be for the use of the Senate; and

(B) 1,000 copies shall be bound (500 paperbound, 250 nontabbed black skiver, 200 tabbed black skiver) and delivered as may be directed by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5117. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 34, to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

SA 5118. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5117 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 34, supra.

SA 5119. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 34, supra.

SA 5120. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5119 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 34, supra.

SA 5121. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5120 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 5119 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 34, supra.

SA 5122. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 34, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5123. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. BURR (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2058, to require the Secretary of Commerce to study the coverage gaps of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service and to develop a plan for improving radar coverage and hazardous weather detection and forecasting.

SA 5124. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. BURR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2058, supra.

SA 5125. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1561, to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes.

SA 5126. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Ms. CANTWELL) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5125 proposed by Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON)) to the bill H.R. 1561, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5117. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 34, to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 5118. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5117 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 34, to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

SA 5119. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 34, to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 5120. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5119 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 34, to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program

of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

SA 5121. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5120 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 5119 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 34, to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “4” and insert “5”.

SA 5122. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 34, to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. ____ USE OF UNAPPROVED MEDICAL PRODUCTS BY PATIENTS DIAGNOSED WITH A TERMINAL ILLNESS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Trickett Wendler Right to Try Act of 2016”.

(b) **USE OF UNAPPROVED MEDICAL PRODUCTS BY PATIENTS DIAGNOSED WITH A TERMINAL ILLNESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), and any other provision of Federal law, the Federal Government shall not take any action to prohibit or restrict—

(A) the production, manufacture, distribution, prescribing, or dispensing of an experimental drug, biological product, or device that—

(i) is intended to treat a patient who has been diagnosed with a terminal illness; and

(ii) is authorized by, and in accordance with, State law; and

(B) the possession or use of an experimental drug, biological product, or device—

(i) that is described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A); and

(ii) for which the patient has received a certification from a physician, who is in good standing with the physician’s certifying organization or board, that the patient has exhausted, or otherwise does not meet qualifying criteria to receive, any other available treatment options.

(2) **NO LIABILITY OR USE OF OUTCOMES.**—

(A) **NO LIABILITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no liability shall lie against a producer, manufacturer, distributor, prescriber, dispenser, possessor, or user of an experimental drug, biological product, or device for the production, manufacture, distribution, prescribing, dispensing, possession, or use of an experimental drug, biological product, or device that is in compliance with paragraph (1).

(B) **NO USE OF OUTCOMES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the outcome of any production, manufacture, distribution, prescribing, dispensing, possession, or use of an experimental drug, biological product, or device that was done in compliance with paragraph (1) shall not be used by a Federal agency reviewing the experimental drug, biological product, or device to delay or other-

wise adversely impact review or approval of such experimental drug, biological product, or device.

(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(A) **BIOLOGICAL PRODUCT.**—The term “biological product” has the meaning given to such term in section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262).

(B) **DEVICE; DRUG.**—The terms “device” and “drug” have the meanings given to such terms in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(C) **EXPERIMENTAL DRUG, BIOLOGICAL PRODUCT, OR DEVICE.**—The term “experimental drug, biological product, or device” means a drug, biological product, or device that—

(i) has successfully completed a phase 1 clinical investigation;

(ii) remains under investigation in a clinical trial approved by the Food and Drug Administration; and

(iii) is not approved, licensed, or cleared for commercial distribution under section 505, 510(k), or 515 of the Federal Food, Drug, or Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355, 360(k), 360(e)) or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262).

(D) **PHASE 1 CLINICAL INVESTIGATION.**—The term “phase 1 clinical investigation” means a phase 1 clinical investigation, as described in section 312.21 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

(E) **TERMINAL ILLNESS.**—The term “terminal illness” has the meaning given to such term in the State law specified in paragraph (1)(A)(ii).

SA 5123. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. BURR (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2058, to require the Secretary of Commerce to study the coverage gaps of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service and to develop a plan for improving radar coverage and hazardous weather detection and forecasting; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SEC. ____ STUDY ON GAPS IN NEXRAD COVERAGE AND REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN TO ADDRESS SUCH GAPS.

(a) **STUDY ON GAPS IN NEXRAD COVERAGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall complete a study on gaps in the coverage of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service (referred to in this section as “NEXRAD”).

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—In conducting the study required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) identify areas in the United States with limited or no NEXRAD coverage below 6,000 feet above ground level of the surrounding terrain;

(B) for the areas identified under subparagraph (A)—

(i) identify the key weather effects for which prediction would improve with improved radar detection;

(ii) identify additional sources of observations for high impact weather that were available and operational for such areas on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (commonly known as “TDWR”), air surveillance radars of the Federal Aviation Administration, and cooperative network observers; and

(iii) assess the feasibility and advisability of efforts to integrate and upgrade Federal radar capabilities that are not owned or controlled by the National Oceanic and Atmos-

pheric Administration, including radar capabilities of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Defense;

(C) assess the feasibility and advisability of incorporating State-operated and other non-Federal radars into the operations of the National Weather Service;

(D) identify options to improve radar coverage in the areas identified under subparagraph (A); and

(E) estimate the cost of, and develop a timeline for, carrying out each of the options identified under subparagraph (D).

(3) **REPORT.**—Upon the completion of the study required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that includes the findings of the Secretary with respect to the study.

(b) **PLAN TO IMPROVE RADAR COVERAGE.**—Not later than 30 days after the completion of the study under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a plan to the congressional committees referred to in subsection (a)(3) for improving radar coverage in the areas identified under subsection (a)(2)(A) by integrating and upgrading, to the extent practicable, additional observation solutions to improve hazardous weather detection and forecasting.

(c) **REQUIREMENT FOR THIRD-PARTY REVIEWS REGARDING PLAN TO IMPROVE RADAR COVERAGE.**—The Secretary of Commerce shall seek third-party reviews on scientific methodology relating to, and the feasibility and advisability of, implementing the plan submitted under subsection (b), including the extent to which warning and forecast services of the National Weather Service would be improved by additional NEXRAD coverage.

SA 5124. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. BURR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2058, to require the Secretary of Commerce to study the coverage gaps of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service and to develop a plan for improving radar coverage and hazardous weather detection and forecasting; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to study the coverage gaps of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service and to develop a plan for improving radar coverage and hazardous weather detection and forecasting.”

SA 5125. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1561, to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2016”.

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—UNITED STATES WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING IMPROVEMENT

- Sec. 101. Public safety priority.
Sec. 102. Weather research and forecasting innovation.
Sec. 103. Tornado warning improvement and extension program.
Sec. 104. Hurricane forecast improvement program.
Sec. 105. Weather research and development planning.
Sec. 106. Observing system planning.
Sec. 107. Observing system simulation experiments.
Sec. 108. Annual report on computing resources prioritization.
Sec. 109. United States Weather Research program.

TITLE II—SUBSEASONAL AND SEASONAL FORECASTING INNOVATION

- Sec. 201. Improving subseasonal and seasonal forecasts.

TITLE III—WEATHER SATELLITE AND DATA INNOVATION

- Sec. 301. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration satellite and data management.
Sec. 302. Commercial weather data.
Sec. 303. Unnecessary duplication.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL WEATHER COORDINATION

- Sec. 401. Environmental Information Services Working Group.
Sec. 402. Interagency weather research and forecast innovation coordination.
Sec. 403. Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and National Weather Service exchange program.
Sec. 404. Visiting fellows at National Weather Service.
Sec. 405. Warning coordination meteorologists at weather forecast offices of National Weather Service.
Sec. 406. Improving National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration communication of hazardous weather and water events.
Sec. 407. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Ready All Hazards Award Program.
Sec. 408. Department of Defense weather forecasting activities.
Sec. 409. National Weather Service; operations and workforce analysis.
Sec. 410. Water resources.
Sec. 411. Report on contract positions at National Weather Service.
Sec. 412. Weather impacts to communities and infrastructure.
Sec. 413. Weather enterprise outreach.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

- (1) **SEASONAL.**—The term “seasonal” means the time range between 3 months and 2 years.
(2) **STATE.**—The term “State” means a State, a territory, or possession of the United States, including a Commonwealth, or the District of Columbia.
(3) **SUBSEASONAL.**—The term “subseasonal” means the time range between 2 weeks and 3 months.
(4) **UNDER SECRETARY.**—The term “Under Secretary” means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.
(5) **WEATHER INDUSTRY AND WEATHER ENTERPRISE.**—The terms “weather industry” and “weather enterprise” are interchangeable in

this Act, and include individuals and organizations from public, private, and academic sectors that contribute to the research, development, and production of weather forecast products, and primary consumers of these weather forecast products.

TITLE I—UNITED STATES WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 101. PUBLIC SAFETY PRIORITY.

In conducting research, the Under Secretary shall prioritize improving weather data, modeling, computing, forecasting, and warnings for the protection of life and property and for the enhancement of the national economy.

SEC. 102. WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION.

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Assistant Administrator for the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research shall conduct a program to develop improved understanding of and forecast capabilities for atmospheric events and their impacts, placing priority on developing more accurate, timely, and effective warnings and forecasts of high impact weather events that endanger life and property.

(b) **PROGRAM ELEMENTS.**—The program described in subsection (a) shall focus on the following activities:

(1) Improving the fundamental understanding of weather consistent with section 101, including the boundary layer and other processes affecting high impact weather events.

(2) Improving the understanding of how the public receives, interprets, and responds to warnings and forecasts of high impact weather events that endanger life and property.

(3) Research and development, and transfer of knowledge, technologies, and applications to the National Weather Service and other appropriate agencies and entities, including the United States weather industry and academic partners, related to—

(A) advanced radar, radar networking technologies, and other ground-based technologies, including those emphasizing rapid, fine-scale sensing of the boundary layer and lower troposphere, and the use of innovative, dual-polarization, phased-array technologies;

(B) aerial weather observing systems;

(C) high performance computing and information technology and wireless communication networks;

(D) advanced numerical weather prediction systems and forecasting tools and techniques that improve the forecasting of timing, track, intensity, and severity of high impact weather, including through—

(i) the development of more effective mesoscale models;

(ii) more effective use of existing, and the development of new, regional and national cloud-resolving models;

(iii) enhanced global weather models; and

(iv) integrated assessment models;

(E) quantitative assessment tools for measuring the impact and value of data and observing systems, including Observing System Simulation Experiments (as described in section 107), Observing System Experiments, and Analyses of Alternatives;

(F) atmospheric chemistry and interactions essential to accurately characterizing atmospheric composition and predicting meteorological processes, including cloud microphysical, precipitation, and atmospheric electrification processes, to more effectively understand their role in severe weather; and

(G) additional sources of weather data and information, including commercial observing systems.

(4) A technology transfer initiative, carried out jointly and in coordination with the Di-

rector of the National Weather Service, and in cooperation with the United States weather industry and academic partners, to ensure continuous development and transition of the latest scientific and technological advances into operations of the National Weather Service and to establish a process to sunset outdated and expensive operational methods and tools to enable cost-effective transfer of new methods and tools into operations.

(c) **EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the program under this section, the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research shall collaborate with and support the non-Federal weather research community, which includes institutions of higher education, private entities, and nongovernmental organizations, by making funds available through competitive grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that not less than 30 percent of the funds for weather research and development at the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research should be made available for the purpose described in paragraph (1).

(d) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Each year, concurrent with the annual budget request submitted by the President to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Under Secretary shall submit to Congress a description of current and planned activities under this section.

SEC. 103. TORNADO WARNING IMPROVEMENT AND EXTENSION PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Under Secretary, in collaboration with the United States weather industry and academic partners, shall establish a tornado warning improvement and extension program.

(b) **GOAL.**—The goal of such program shall be to reduce the loss of life and economic losses from tornadoes through the development and extension of accurate, effective, and timely tornado forecasts, predictions, and warnings, including the prediction of tornadoes beyond one hour in advance.

(c) **PROGRAM PLAN.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, in coordination with the Director of the National Weather Service, shall develop a program plan that details the specific research, development, and technology transfer activities, as well as corresponding resources and timelines, necessary to achieve the program goal.

(d) **ANNUAL BUDGET FOR PLAN SUBMITTAL.**—Following completion of the plan, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and in coordination with the Director of the National Weather Service, shall, not less frequently than once each year, submit to Congress a proposed budget corresponding with the activities identified in the plan.

SEC. 104. HURRICANE FORECAST IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Under Secretary, in collaboration with the United States weather industry and such academic entities as the Administrator considers appropriate, shall maintain a project to improve hurricane forecasting.

(b) **GOAL.**—The goal of the project maintained under subsection (a) shall be to develop and extend accurate hurricane forecasts and warnings in order to reduce loss of life, injury, and damage to the economy, with a focus on—

(1) improving the prediction of rapid intensification and track of hurricanes;

(2) improving the forecast and communication of storm surges from hurricanes; and

(3) incorporating risk communication research to create more effective watch and warning products.

(c) **PROJECT PLAN.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and in consultation with the Director of the National Weather Service, shall develop a plan for the project maintained under subsection (a) that details the specific research, development, and technology transfer activities, as well as corresponding resources and timelines, necessary to achieve the goal set forth in subsection (b).

SEC. 105. WEATHER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once each year thereafter, the Under Secretary, acting through the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and in coordination with the Director of the National Weather Service and the Assistant Administrator for Satellite and Information Services, shall issue a research and development and research to operations plan to restore and maintain United States leadership in numerical weather prediction and forecasting that—

(1) describes the forecasting skill and technology goals, objectives, and progress of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in carrying out the program conducted under section 102;

(2) identifies and prioritizes specific research and development activities, and performance metrics, weighted to meet the operational weather mission of the National Weather Service to achieve a weather-ready Nation;

(3) describes how the program will collaborate with stakeholders, including the United States weather industry and academic partners; and

(4) identifies, through consultation with the National Science Foundation, the United States weather industry, and academic partners, research necessary to enhance the integration of social science knowledge into weather forecast and warning processes, including to improve the communication of threat information necessary to enable improved severe weather planning and decision-making on the part of individuals and communities.

SEC. 106. OBSERVING SYSTEM PLANNING.

The Under Secretary shall—

(1) develop and maintain a prioritized list of observation data requirements necessary to ensure weather forecasting capabilities to protect life and property to the maximum extent practicable;

(2) consistent with section 107, utilize Observing System Simulation Experiments, Observing System Experiments, Analyses of Alternatives, and other appropriate assessment tools to ensure continuous systemic evaluations of the observing systems, data, and information needed to meet the requirements of paragraph (1), including options to maximize observational capabilities and their cost-effectiveness;

(3) identify current and potential future data gaps in observing capabilities related to the requirements listed under paragraph (1); and

(4) determine a range of options to address gaps identified under paragraph (3).

SEC. 107. OBSERVING SYSTEM SIMULATION EXPERIMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In support of the requirements of section 106, the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research shall undertake Observing System Simulation Experiments, or such other quantitative

assessments as the Assistant Administrator considers appropriate, to quantitatively assess the relative value and benefits of observing capabilities and systems. Technical and scientific Observing System Simulation Experiment evaluations—

(1) may include assessments of the impact of observing capabilities on—

(A) global weather prediction;

(B) hurricane track and intensity forecasting;

(C) tornado warning lead times and accuracy;

(D) prediction of mid-latitude severe local storm outbreaks; and

(E) prediction of storms that have the potential to cause extreme precipitation and flooding lasting from 6 hours to 1 week; and

(2) shall be conducted in cooperation with other appropriate entities within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, other Federal agencies, the United States weather industry, and academic partners to ensure the technical and scientific merit of results from Observing System Simulation Experiments or other appropriate quantitative assessment methodologies.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—Observing System Simulation Experiments shall quantitatively—

(1) determine the potential impact of proposed space-based, suborbital, and in situ observing systems on analyses and forecasts, including potential impacts on extreme weather events across all parts of the Nation;

(2) evaluate and compare observing system design options; and

(3) assess the relative capabilities and costs of various observing systems and combinations of observing systems in providing data necessary to protect life and property.

(c) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—Observing System Simulation Experiments—

(1) shall be conducted prior to the acquisition of major Government-owned or Government-leased operational observing systems, including polar-orbiting and geostationary satellite systems, with a lifecycle cost of more than \$500,000,000; and

(2) shall be conducted prior to the purchase of any major new commercially provided data with a lifecycle cost of more than \$500,000,000.

(d) **PRIORITY OBSERVING SYSTEM SIMULATION EXPERIMENTS.**—

(1) **GLOBAL NAVIGATION SATELLITE SYSTEM RADIO OCCULTATION.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research shall complete an Observing System Simulation Experiment to assess the value of data from Global Navigation Satellite System Radio Occultation.

(2) **GEOSTATIONARY HYPERSPECTRAL SOUNDER GLOBAL CONSTELLATION.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research shall complete an Observing System Simulation Experiment to assess the value of data from a geostationary hyperspectral sounder global constellation.

(e) **RESULTS.**—Upon completion of all Observing System Simulation Experiments, the Assistant Administrator shall make available to the public the results an assessment of related private and public sector weather data sourcing options, including their availability, affordability, and cost-effectiveness. Such assessments shall be developed in accordance with section 50503 of title 51, United States Code.

SEC. 108. ANNUAL REPORT ON COMPUTING RESOURCES PRIORITIZATION.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once each year thereafter, the

Under Secretary, acting through the Chief Information Officer of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and in coordination with the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the Director of the National Weather Service, shall produce and make publicly available a report that explains how the Under Secretary intends—

(1) to continually support upgrades to pursue the fastest, most powerful, and cost-effective high performance computing technologies in support of its weather prediction mission;

(2) to ensure a balance between the research to operations requirements to develop the next generation of regional and global models as well as highly reliable operational models;

(3) to take advantage of advanced development concepts to, as appropriate, make next generation weather prediction models available in beta-test mode to operational forecasters, the United States weather industry, and partners in academic and Government research; and

(4) to use existing computing resources to improve advanced research and operational weather prediction.

SEC. 109. UNITED STATES WEATHER RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 108 of the Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-567; 15 U.S.C. 313 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, not less frequently than once each year, a report, including—

“(A) a list of ongoing research projects;

“(B) project goals and a point of contact for each project;

“(C) the 5 projects related to weather observations, short-term weather, or subseasonal forecasts within Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research that are closest to operationalization,

“(D) for each project referred to in subparagraph (C)—

“(i) the potential benefit;

“(ii) any barrier to operationalization; and

“(iii) the plan for operationalization, including which line office will financially support the project and how much the line office intends to spend;

“(6) establish teams with staff from the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the National Weather Service to oversee the operationalization of research products developed by the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research;

“(7) develop mechanisms for research priorities of the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research to be informed by the relevant line offices within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the relevant user community, and the weather enterprise;

“(8) develop an internal mechanism to track the progress of each research project within the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and mechanisms to terminate a project that is not adequately progressing;

“(9) develop and implement a system to track whether extramural research grant goals were accomplished;

“(10) provide facilities for products developed by the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research to be tested in operational simulations, such as test beds; and

“(11) encourage academic collaboration with the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the National Weather Service by facilitating visiting scholars.”;

(2) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the” and inserting “The”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **SUBSEASONAL DEFINED.**—In this section, the term ‘subseasonal’ means the time range between 2 weeks and 3 months.”.

SEC. 110. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **FISCAL YEARS 2016 THROUGH 2018.**—For each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018, there are authorized to be appropriated to Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research—

(1) \$111,516,000 to carry out this title, of which—

(A) \$85,758,000 is authorized for weather laboratories and cooperative institutes; and

(B) \$25,758,000 is authorized for weather and air chemistry research programs; and

(2) an additional amount of \$20,000,000 for the joint technology transfer initiative described in section 102(b)(4).

(b) **LIMITATION.**—No additional funds are authorized to carry out this title and the amendments made by this title.

TITLE II—SUBSEASONAL AND SEASONAL FORECASTING INNOVATION

SEC. 201. IMPROVING SUBSEASONAL AND SEASONAL FORECASTS.

Section 1762 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-198; 15 U.S.C. 313 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a)” and inserting “(a) FINDINGS.—”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “(b)” and inserting “(b) POLICY.—”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Under Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Weather Service and the heads of such other programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as the Under Secretary considers appropriate, shall—

“(1) collect and utilize information in order to make usable, reliable, and timely foundational forecasts of subseasonal and seasonal temperature and precipitation;

“(2) leverage existing research and models from the weather enterprise to improve the forecasts under paragraph (1);

“(3) determine and provide information on how the forecasted conditions under paragraph (1) may impact—

“(A) the number and severity of droughts, fires, tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, heat waves, coastal inundation, winter storms, high impact weather, or other relevant natural disasters;

“(B) snowpack; and

“(C) sea ice conditions; and

“(4) develop an Internet clearinghouse to provide the forecasts under paragraph (1) and the information under paragraphs (1) and (3) on both national and regional levels.

“(d) **COMMUNICATION.**—The Director of the National Weather Service shall provide the forecasts under paragraph (1) of subsection (c) and the information on their impacts under paragraph (3) of such subsection to the public, including public and private entities engaged in planning and preparedness, such as National Weather Service Core partners at the Federal, regional, State, tribal, and local levels of government.

“(e) **COOPERATION.**—The Under Secretary shall build upon existing forecasting and assessment programs and partnerships, including—

“(1) by designating research and monitoring activities related to subseasonal and seasonal forecasts as a priority in 1 or more solicitations of the Cooperative Institutes of the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research;

“(2) by contributing to the interagency Earth System Prediction Capability; and

“(3) by consulting with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to determine the highest priority subseasonal and seasonal forecast needs to enhance national security.

“(f) FORECAST COMMUNICATION COORDINATORS.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Under Secretary shall foster effective communication, understanding, and use of the forecasts by the intended users of the information described in subsection (d). This may include assistance to States for forecast communication coordinators to enable local interpretation and planning based on the information.

“(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—For each State that requests assistance under this subsection, the Under Secretary may—

“(A) provide funds to support an individual in that State—

“(i) to serve as a liaison among the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, other Federal departments and agencies, the weather enterprise, the State, and relevant interests within that State; and

“(ii) to receive the forecasts and information under subsection (c) and disseminate the forecasts and information throughout the State, including to county and tribal governments; and

“(B) require matching funds of at least 50 percent, from the State, a university, a non-governmental organization, a trade association, or the private sector.

“(3) **LIMITATION.**—Assistance to an individual State under this subsection shall not exceed \$100,000 in a fiscal year.

“(g) **COOPERATION FROM OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—Each Federal department and agency shall cooperate as appropriate with the Under Secretary in carrying out this section.

“(h) REPORTS.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2016, the Under Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report, including—

“(A) an analysis of the how information from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on subseasonal and seasonal forecasts, as provided under subsection (c), is utilized in public planning and preparedness;

“(B) specific plans and goals for the continued development of the subseasonal and seasonal forecasts and related products described in subsection (c); and

“(C) an identification of research, monitoring, observing, and forecasting requirements to meet the goals described in subparagraph (B).

“(2) **CONSULTATION.**—In developing the report under paragraph (1), the Under Secretary shall consult with relevant Federal, regional, State, tribal, and local government agencies, research institutions, and the private sector.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) **FOUNDATIONAL FORECAST.**—The term ‘foundational forecast’ means basic weather observation and forecast data, largely in raw form, before further processing is applied.

“(2) **NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE CORE PARTNERS.**—The term ‘National Weather Service core partners’ means government and non-government entities which are directly in-

involved in the preparation or dissemination of, or discussions involving, hazardous weather or other emergency information put out by the National Weather Service.

“(3) **SEASONAL.**—The term ‘seasonal’ means the time range between 3 months and 2 years.

“(4) **STATE.**—The term ‘State’ means a State, a territory, or possession of the United States, including a Commonwealth, or the District of Columbia.

“(5) **SUBSEASONAL.**—The term ‘subseasonal’ means the time range between 2 weeks and 3 months.

“(6) **UNDER SECRETARY.**—The term ‘Under Secretary’ means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

“(7) **WEATHER INDUSTRY AND WEATHER ENTERPRISE.**—The terms ‘weather industry’ and ‘weather enterprise’ are interchangeable in this section and include individuals and organizations from public, private, and academic sectors that contribute to the research, development, and production of weather forecast products, and primary consumers of these weather forecast products.

“(j) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—For each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018, there are authorized out of funds appropriated to the National Weather Service, \$26,500,000 to carry out the activities of this section.”.

TITLE III—WEATHER SATELLITE AND DATA INNOVATION

SEC. 301. NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION SATELLITE AND DATA MANAGEMENT.

(a) **SHORT-TERM MANAGEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL OBSERVATIONS.—**

(1) **MICROSATELLITE CONSTELLATIONS.—**

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Under Secretary shall complete and operationalize the Constellation Observing System for Meteorology, Ionosphere, and Climate-1 and Climate-2 (COSMIC) in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(i) by deploying constellations of microsats in both the equatorial and polar orbits;

(ii) by integrating the resulting data and research into all national operational and research weather forecast models; and

(iii) by ensuring that the resulting data of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s COSMIC-1 and COSMIC-2 programs are free and open to all communities.

(B) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Not less frequently than once each year until the Under Secretary has completed and operationalized the program described in subparagraph (A) pursuant to such subparagraph, the Under Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the status of the efforts of the Under Secretary to carry out such subparagraph.

(2) **INTEGRATION OF OCEAN AND COASTAL DATA FROM THE INTEGRATED OCEAN OBSERVING SYSTEM.**—In National Weather Service Regions where the Director of the National Weather Service determines that ocean and coastal data would improve forecasts, the Director, in consultation with the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the Assistant Administrator of the National Ocean Service, shall—

(A) integrate additional coastal and ocean observations, and other data and research, from the Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS) into regional weather forecasts to improve weather forecasts and forecasting decision support systems; and

(B) support the development of real-time data sharing products and forecast products in collaboration with the regional associations of such system, including contributions from the private sector, academia, and research institutions to ensure timely and accurate use of ocean and coastal data in regional forecasts.

(3) EXISTING MONITORING AND OBSERVATION-CAPABILITY.—The Under Secretary shall identify degradation of existing monitoring and observation capabilities that could lead to a reduction in forecast quality.

(4) SPECIFICATIONS FOR NEW SATELLITE SYSTEMS OR DATA DETERMINED BY OPERATIONAL NEEDS.—In developing specifications for any satellite systems or data to follow the Joint Polar Satellite System, Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellites, and any other satellites, in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall ensure the specifications are determined to the extent practicable by the recommendations of the reports under subsection (b) of this section.

(b) INDEPENDENT STUDY ON FUTURE OF NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION SATELLITE SYSTEMS AND DATA.—

(1) AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary shall seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to perform the services covered by this subsection.

(B) TIMING.—The Under Secretary shall seek to enter into the agreement described in subparagraph (A) before September 30, 2018.

(2) STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Under an agreement between the Under Secretary and the National Academy of Sciences under this subsection, the National Academy of Sciences shall conduct a study on matters concerning future satellite data needs.

(B) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study under subparagraph (A), the National Academy of Sciences shall—

(i) develop recommendations on how to make the data portfolio of the Administration more robust and cost-effective;

(ii) assess the costs and benefits of moving toward a constellation of many small satellites, standardizing satellite bus design, relying more on the purchasing of data, or acquiring data from other sources or methods;

(iii) identify the environmental observations that are essential to the performance of weather models, based on an assessment of Federal, academic, and private sector weather research, and the cost of obtaining the environmental data;

(iv) identify environmental observations that improve the quality of operational and research weather models in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act;

(v) identify and prioritize new environmental observations that could contribute to existing and future weather models; and

(vi) develop recommendations on a portfolio of environmental observations that balances essential, quality-improving, and new data, private and nonprivate sources, and space-based and Earth-based sources.

(C) DEADLINE AND REPORT.—In carrying out the study under subparagraph (A), the National Academy of Sciences shall complete and transmit to the Under Secretary a report containing the findings of the National Academy of Sciences with respect to the study not later than 2 years after the date on which the Administrator enters into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences under paragraph (1)(A).

(3) ALTERNATE ORGANIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Under Secretary is unable within the period prescribed in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) to enter into an agreement described in subparagraph (A) of such paragraph with the National Academy of Sciences on terms acceptable to the Under Secretary, the Under Secretary shall seek to enter into such an agreement with another appropriate organization that—

- (i) is not part of the Federal Government;
- (ii) operates as a not-for-profit entity; and

(iii) has expertise and objectivity comparable to that of the National Academy of Sciences.

(B) TREATMENT.—If the Under Secretary enters into an agreement with another organization as described in subparagraph (A), any reference in this subsection to the National Academy of Sciences shall be treated as a reference to the other organization.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated, out of funds appropriated to National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service, to carry out this subsection \$1,000,000 for the period encompassing fiscal years 2018 through 2019.

SEC. 302. COMMERCIAL WEATHER DATA.

(a) DATA AND HOSTED SATELLITE PAYLOADS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce may enter into agreements for—

(1) the purchase of weather data through contracts with commercial providers; and

(2) the placement of weather satellite instruments on cohosted government or private payloads.

(b) STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Under Secretary, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a strategy to enable the procurement of quality commercial weather data. The strategy shall assess the range of commercial opportunities, including public-private partnerships, for obtaining surface-based, aviation-based, and space-based weather observations. The strategy shall include the expected cost-effectiveness of these opportunities as well as provide a plan for procuring data, including an expected implementation timeline, from these nongovernmental sources, as appropriate.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The strategy shall include—

(A) an analysis of financial or other benefits to, and risks associated with, acquiring commercial weather data or services, including through multiyear acquisition approaches;

(B) an identification of methods to address planning, programming, budgeting, and execution challenges to such approaches, including—

(i) how standards will be set to ensure that data is reliable and effective;

(ii) how data may be acquired through commercial experimental or innovative techniques and then evaluated for integration into operational use;

(iii) how to guarantee public access to all forecast-critical data to ensure that the United States weather industry and the public continue to have access to information critical to their work; and

(iv) in accordance with section 50503 of title 51, United States Code, methods to address potential termination liability or cancellation costs associated with weather data or service contracts; and

(C) an identification of any changes needed in the requirements development and approval processes of the Department of Commerce to facilitate effective and efficient implementation of such strategy.

(3) AUTHORITY FOR AGREEMENTS.—The Assistant Administrator for National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service may enter into multiyear agreements necessary to carry out the strategy developed under this subsection.

(c) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) CRITERIA.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the

Under Secretary shall publish data and metadata standards and specifications for space-based commercial weather data, including radio occultation data, and, as soon as possible, geostationary hyperspectral sounder data.

(2) PILOT CONTRACTS.—

(A) CONTRACTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall, through an open competition, enter into at least one pilot contract with one or more private sector entities capable of providing data that meet the standards and specifications set by the Under Secretary for providing commercial weather data in a manner that allows the Under Secretary to calibrate and evaluate the data for its use in National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration meteorological models.

(B) ASSESSMENT OF DATA VIABILITY.—Not later than the date that is 3 years after the date on which the Under Secretary enters into a contract under subparagraph (A), the Under Secretary shall assess and submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives the results of a determination of the extent to which data provided under the contract entered into under subparagraph (A) meet the criteria published under paragraph (1) and the extent to which the pilot program has demonstrated—

(i) the viability of assimilating the commercially provided data into National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration meteorological models;

(ii) whether, and by how much, the data add value to weather forecasts; and

(iii) the accuracy, quality, timeliness, validity, reliability, usability, information technology security, and cost-effectiveness of obtaining commercial weather data from private sector providers.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020, there are authorized to be appropriated for procurement, acquisition, and construction at National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service, \$6,000,000 to carry out this subsection.

(d) OBTAINING FUTURE DATA.—If an assessment under subsection (c)(2)(B) demonstrates the ability of commercial weather data to meet data and metadata standards and specifications published under subsection (c)(1), the Under Secretary shall—

(1) where appropriate, cost-effective, and feasible, obtain commercial weather data from private sector providers;

(2) as early as possible in the acquisition process for any future National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration meteorological space system, consider whether there is a suitable, cost-effective, commercial capability available or that will be available to meet any or all of the observational requirements by the planned operational date of the system;

(3) if a suitable, cost-effective, commercial capability is or will be available as described in paragraph (2), determine whether it is in the national interest to develop a governmental meteorological space system; and

(4) submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report detailing any determination made under paragraphs (2) and (3).

(e) DATA SHARING PRACTICES.—The Under Secretary shall continue to meet the international meteorological agreements into which the Under Secretary has entered, including practices set forth through World Meteorological Organization Resolution 40.

SEC. 303. UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION.

In meeting the requirements under this title, the Under Secretary shall avoid unnecessary duplication between public and private sources of data and the corresponding expenditure of funds and employment of personnel.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL WEATHER COORDINATION**SEC. 401. ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION SERVICES WORKING GROUP.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Science Advisory Board shall continue to maintain a standing working group named the Environmental Information Services Working Group (in this section referred to as the “Working Group”)—

(1) to provide advice for prioritizing weather research initiatives at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to produce real improvement in weather forecasting;

(2) to provide advice on existing or emerging technologies or techniques that can be found in private industry or the research community that could be incorporated into forecasting at the National Weather Service to improve forecasting skill;

(3) to identify opportunities to improve—

(A) communications between weather forecasters, Federal, State, local, tribal, and other emergency management personnel, and the public; and

(B) communications and partnerships among the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the private and academic sectors; and

(4) to address such other matters as the Science Advisory Board requests of the Working Group.

(b) **COMPOSITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Working Group shall be composed of leading experts and innovators from all relevant fields of science and engineering including atmospheric chemistry, atmospheric physics, meteorology, hydrology, social science, risk communications, electrical engineering, and computer sciences. In carrying out this section, the Working Group may organize into subpanels.

(2) **NUMBER.**—The Working Group shall be composed of no fewer than 15 members. Nominees for the Working Group may be forwarded by the Working Group for approval by the Science Advisory Board. Members of the Working Group may choose a chair (or co-chairs) from among their number with approval by the Science Advisory Board.

(c) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not less frequently than once each year, the Working Group shall transmit to the Science Advisory Board for submission to the Under Secretary a report on progress made by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in adopting the Working Group’s recommendations. The Science Advisory Board shall transmit this report to the Under Secretary. Within 30 days of receipt of such report, the Under Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a copy of such report.

SEC. 402. INTERAGENCY WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECAST INNOVATION COORDINATION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish an Interagency Committee for Advancing Weather Services to improve coordination of relevant weather research and forecast innovation activities across the Federal Government. The Interagency Committee shall—

(1) include participation by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the

Federal Aviation Administration, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and its constituent elements, the National Science Foundation, and such other agencies involved in weather forecasting research as the President determines are appropriate;

(2) identify and prioritize top forecast needs and coordinate those needs against budget requests and program initiatives across participating offices and agencies; and

(3) share information regarding operational needs and forecasting improvements across relevant agencies.

(b) **CO-CHAIR.**—The Federal Coordinator for Meteorology shall serve as a co-chair of this panel.

(c) **FURTHER COORDINATION.**—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall take such other steps as are necessary to coordinate the activities of the Federal Government with those of the United States weather industry, State governments, emergency managers, and academic researchers.

SEC. 403. OFFICE OF OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH AND NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE EXCHANGE PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the Director of National Weather Service may establish a program to detail Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research personnel to the National Weather Service and National Weather Service personnel to the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research.

(b) **GOAL.**—The goal of this program is to enhance forecasting innovation through regular, direct interaction between the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research’s world-class scientists and the National Weather Service’s operational staff.

(c) **ELEMENTS.**—The program shall allow up to 10 Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research staff and National Weather Service staff to spend up to 1 year on detail. Candidates shall be jointly selected by the Assistant Administrator for Oceanic and Atmospheric Research and the Director of the National Weather Service.

(d) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not less frequently than once each year, the Under Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on participation in such program and shall highlight any innovations that come from this interaction.

SEC. 404. VISITING FELLOWS AT NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Weather Service may establish a program to host postdoctoral fellows and academic researchers at any of the National Centers for Environmental Prediction.

(b) **GOAL.**—This program shall be designed to provide direct interaction between forecasters and talented academic and private sector researchers in an effort to bring innovation to forecasting tools and techniques to the National Weather Service.

(c) **SELECTION AND APPOINTMENT.**—Such fellows shall be competitively selected and appointed for a term not to exceed 1 year.

SEC. 405. WARNING COORDINATION METEOROLOGISTS AT WEATHER FORECAST OFFICES OF NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(a) **DESIGNATION OF WARNING COORDINATION METEOROLOGISTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Weather Service shall designate at least 1 warning coordination meteorologist at each weather forecast office of the National Weather Service.

(2) **NO ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES AUTHORIZED.**—Nothing in this section shall be con-

strued to authorize or require a change in the authorized number of full time equivalent employees in the National Weather Service or otherwise result in the employment of any additional employees.

(3) **PERFORMANCE BY OTHER EMPLOYEES.**—Performance of the responsibilities outlined in this section is not limited to the warning coordination meteorologist position.

(b) **PRIMARY ROLE OF WARNING COORDINATION METEOROLOGISTS.**—The primary role of the warning coordination meteorologist shall be to carry out the responsibilities required by this section.

(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), consistent with the analysis described in section 409, and in order to increase impact-based decision support services, each warning coordination meteorologist designated under subsection (a) shall—

(A) be responsible for providing service to the geographic area of responsibility covered by the weather forecast office at which the warning coordination meteorologist is employed to help ensure that users of products of the National Weather Service can respond effectively to improve outcomes from weather events;

(B) liaise with users of products and services of the National Weather Service, such as the public, media outlets, users in the aviation, marine, and agricultural communities, and forestry, land, and water management interests, to evaluate the adequacy and usefulness of the products and services of the National Weather Service;

(C) collaborate with such weather forecast offices and State, local, and tribal government agencies as the Director considers appropriate in developing, proposing, and implementing plans to develop, modify, or tailor products and services of the National Weather Service to improve the usefulness of such products and services;

(D) ensure the maintenance and accuracy of severe weather call lists, appropriate office severe weather policy or procedures, and other severe weather or dissemination methodologies or strategies; and

(E) work closely with State, local, and tribal emergency management agencies, and other agencies related to disaster management, to ensure a planned, coordinated, and effective preparedness and response effort.

(2) **OTHER STAFF.**—The Director may assign a responsibility set forth in paragraph (1) to such other staff as the Director considers appropriate to carry out such responsibility.

(d) **ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), a warning coordination meteorologist designated under subsection (a) may—

(A) work with a State agency to develop plans for promoting more effective use of products and services of the National Weather Service throughout the State;

(B) identify priority community preparedness objectives;

(C) develop plans to meet the objectives identified under paragraph (2); and

(D) conduct severe weather event preparedness planning and citizen education efforts with and through various State, local, and tribal government agencies and other disaster management-related organizations.

(2) **OTHER STAFF.**—The Director may assign a responsibility set forth in paragraph (1) to such other staff as the Director considers appropriate to carry out such responsibility.

(e) **PLACEMENT WITH STATE AND LOCAL EMERGENCY MANAGERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out this section, the Director of the National Weather Service may place a warning coordination meteorologist designated under subsection (a) with a State or local emergency manager

if the Director considers doing so is necessary or convenient to carry out this section.

(2) TREATMENT.—If the Director determines that the placement of a warning coordination meteorologist placed with a State or local emergency manager under paragraph (1) is near a weather forecast office of the National Weather Service, such placement shall be treated as designation of the warning coordination meteorologist at such weather forecast office for purposes of subsection (a).

SEC. 406. IMPROVING NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION COMMUNICATION OF HAZARDOUS WEATHER AND WATER EVENTS.

(a) PURPOSE OF SYSTEM.—For purposes of the assessment required by subsection (b)(1)(A), the purpose of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration system for issuing watches and warnings regarding hazardous weather and water events shall be risk communication to the general public that informs action to prevent loss of life and property.

(b) ASSESSMENT OF SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall—

(A) assess the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration system for issuing watches and warnings regarding hazardous weather and water events; and

(B) submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Under Secretary with respect to the assessment conducted under subparagraph (A).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by paragraph (1)(A) shall include the following:

(A) An evaluation of whether the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration system for issuing watches and warnings regarding hazardous weather and water events meets the purpose described in subsection (a).

(B) Development of recommendations for—

(i) legislative and administrative action to improve the system described in paragraph (1)(A); and

(ii) such research as the Under Secretary considers necessary to address the focus areas described in paragraph (3).

(3) FOCUS AREAS.—The assessment required by paragraph (1)(A) shall focus on the following:

(A) Ways to communicate the risks posed by hazardous weather or water events to the public that are most likely to result in action to mitigate the risk.

(B) Ways to communicate the risks posed by hazardous weather or water events to the public as broadly and rapidly as practicable.

(C) Ways to preserve the benefits of the existing watches and warnings system.

(D) Ways to maintain the utility of the watches and warnings system for Government and commercial users of the system.

(4) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the assessment required by paragraph (1)(A), the Under Secretary shall—

(A) consult with such line offices within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as the Under Secretary considers relevant, including the the National Ocean Service, the National Weather Service, and the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research;

(B) consult with individuals in the academic sector, including individuals in the field of social and behavioral sciences, and other weather services;

(C) consult with media outlets that will be distributing the watches and warnings;

(D) consult with non-Federal forecasters that produce alternate severe weather risk communication products;

(E) consult with emergency planners and responders, including State and local emergency management agencies, and other government users of the watches and warnings system, including the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Office of Personnel Management, the Coast Guard, and such other Federal agencies as the Under Secretary determines rely on watches and warnings for operational decisions; and

(F) make use of the services of the National Academy of Sciences, as the Under Secretary considers necessary and practicable, including contracting with the National Research Council to review the scientific and technical soundness of the assessment required by paragraph (1)(A), including the recommendations developed under paragraph (2)(B).

(5) METHODOLOGIES.—In conducting the assessment required by paragraph (1)(A), the Under Secretary shall use such methodologies as the Under Secretary considers are generally accepted by the weather enterprise, including social and behavioral sciences.

(c) IMPROVEMENTS TO SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary shall, based on the assessment required by subsection (b)(1)(A), make such recommendations to Congress to improve the system as the Under Secretary considers necessary—

(A) to improve the system for issuing watches and warnings regarding hazardous weather and water events; and

(B) to support efforts to satisfy research needs to enable future improvements to such system.

(2) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1)(A), the Under Secretary shall ensure that any recommendation that the Under Secretary considers a major change—

(A) is validated by social and behavioral science using a generalizable sample;

(B) accounts for the needs of various demographics, vulnerable populations, and geographic regions;

(C) accounts for the differences between types of weather and water hazards;

(D) responds to the needs of Federal, State, and local government partners and media partners; and

(E) accounts for necessary changes to Federally-operated watch and warning propagation and dissemination infrastructure and protocols.

(d) WATCHES AND WARNINGS DEFINED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), in this section, the terms “watch” and “warning”, with respect to a hazardous weather and water event, mean products issued by the Administration, intended for consumption by the general public, to alert the general public to the potential for or presence of the event and to inform action to prevent loss of life and property.

(2) EXCEPTION.—In this section, the terms “watch” and “warning” do not include technical or specialized meteorological and hydrological forecasts, outlooks, or model guidance products.

SEC. 407. NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION WEATHER READY ALL HAZARDS AWARD PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Director of the National Weather Service is authorized to establish the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Ready All Hazards Award Program. This award program shall provide annual awards to honor individuals or organizations that use or provide National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio All Hazards receivers or transmitters to save lives and protect property. Individuals or organizations

that utilize other early warning tools or applications also qualify for this award.

(b) GOAL.—This award program draws attention to the life-saving work of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Ready All Hazards Program, as well as emerging tools and applications, that provide real-time warning to individuals and communities of severe weather or other hazardous conditions.

(c) PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—

(1) NOMINATIONS.—Nominations for this award shall be made annually by the Weather Field Offices to the Director of the National Weather Service. Broadcast meteorologists, weather radio manufacturers and weather warning tool and application developers, emergency managers, and public safety officials may nominate individuals or organizations to their local Weather Field Offices, but the final list of award nominees must come from the Weather Field Offices.

(2) SELECTION OF AWARDEES.—Annually, the Director of the National Weather Service shall choose winners of this award whose timely actions, based on National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio All Hazards receivers or transmitters or other early warning tools and applications, saved lives or property, or demonstrated public service in support of weather or all hazard warnings.

(3) AWARD CEREMONY.—The Director of the National Weather Service shall establish a means of making these awards to provide maximum public awareness of the importance of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio, and such other warning tools and applications as are represented in the awards.

SEC. 408. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WEATHER FORECASTING ACTIVITIES.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report analyzing the impacts of the proposed Air Force divestiture in the United States Weather Research and Forecasting Model, including—

(1) the impact on—

(A) the United States weather forecasting capabilities;

(B) the accuracy of civilian regional forecasts;

(C) the civilian readiness for traditional weather and extreme weather events in the United States; and

(D) the research necessary to develop the United States Weather Research and Forecasting Model; and

(2) such other analysis relating to the divestiture as the Under Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 409. NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE; OPERATIONS AND WORKFORCE ANALYSIS.

The Under Secretary shall contract or continue to partner with an external organization to conduct a baseline analysis of National Weather Service operations and workforce.

SEC. 410. WATER RESOURCES.

(a) NATIONAL WATER CENTER.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Under Secretary shall maintain a National Water Center.

(2) FUNCTIONS.—The National Water Center may—

(A) facilitate collaboration across Federal and State departments and agencies, academia, and the private sector to improve understanding of water resources;

(B) make recommendations to water resource managers;

(C) make recommendations to improve water resource forecasts; and

(D) facilitate the transition of water research into applications.

(b) **TOTAL WATER PREDICTION.**—The Under Secretary, through the National Water Center, shall—

(1) initiate research and development activities to develop operational water resource prediction products;

(2) collaborate with, and provide decision support regarding total water prediction to, other relevant Federal and State agencies, including—

- (A) the Army Corps of Engineers;
- (B) the United States Geological Survey;
- (C) the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- (D) the National Science Foundation;
- (E) the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (F) State water resource agencies; and
- (G) State emergency management agencies; and

(3) in carrying out the responsibilities described in paragraphs (1) and (2), develop capabilities necessary for total water predictive capacity, including observations, modeling, data management, supercomputing, social science, and communications.

(c) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Water Center shall submit to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works a report on total water predictive capabilities and products.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report may include recommendations to improve engineering, design, operations, and management of civil works projects, including the Central and Southern Florida Project and any project in the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River System, to optimize water management, including the implications of total water predictive products for—

- (A) environmental protection and restoration, including restoration of water quality, water flows, fish, and other aquatic species;
- (B) reduced flood risk; and
- (C) improved recreation.

SEC. 411. REPORT ON CONTRACT POSITIONS AT NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the use of contractors at the National Weather Service for the most recently completed fiscal year.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include, with respect to the most recently completed fiscal year, the following:

(1) The total number of full-time equivalent employees at the National Weather Service, disaggregated by each equivalent level of the General Schedule.

(2) The total number of full-time equivalent contractors at the National Weather Service, disaggregated by each equivalent level of the General Schedule that most closely approximates their duties.

(3) The total number of vacant positions at the National Weather Service on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, disaggregated by each equivalent level of the General Schedule.

(4) The 5 most common positions filled by full-time equivalent contractors at the National Weather Service and the equivalent level of the General Schedule that most closely approximates the duties of such positions.

(5) Of the positions identified under paragraph (4), the percentage of full-time equivalent contractors in those positions that have held a prior position at the National Weather Service or another entity in National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(6) The average full-time equivalent salary for Federal employees at the National

Weather Service for each equivalent level of the General Schedule.

(7) The average salary for full-time equivalent contractors performing at each equivalent level of the General Schedule at the National Weather Service.

(8) A description of any actions taken by the Under Secretary to respond to the issues raised by the Inspector General of the Department of Commerce regarding the hiring of former National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration employees as contractors at the National Weather Service such as the issues raised in the Investigative Report dated June 2, 2015 (OIG-12-0447).

(c) **ANNUAL PUBLICATION.**—For each fiscal year after the fiscal year covered by the report required by subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall, not later than 180 days after the completion of the fiscal year, publish on a publicly accessible Internet website the information described in paragraphs (1) through (8) of subsection (b) for such fiscal year.

SEC. 412. WEATHER IMPACTS TO COMMUNITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) **REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the National Weather Service shall review existing research, products, and services that meet the specific needs of the urban environment, given its unique physical characteristics and forecasting challenges.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The review required by paragraph (1) shall include research, products, and services with the potential to improve modeling and forecasting capabilities, taking into account factors including varying building heights, impermeable surfaces, lack of tree canopy, traffic, pollution, and inter-building wind effects.

(b) **REPORT AND ASSESSMENT.**—Upon completion of the review required by subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the research, products, and services of the National Weather Service, including an assessment of such research, products, and services that is based on the review, public comment, and recent publications by the National Academy of Sciences.

SEC. 413. WEATHER ENTERPRISE OUTREACH.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Under Secretary may establish mechanisms for outreach to the weather enterprise—

(1) to assess the weather forecasts and forecast products provided by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

(2) to determine the highest priority weather forecast needs of the community described in subsection (b).

(b) **OUTREACH COMMUNITY.**—In conducting outreach under subsection (a), the Under Secretary shall contact leading experts and innovators from relevant stakeholders, including the representatives from the following:

(1) State or local emergency management agencies.

(2) State agriculture agencies.

(3) Indian tribes (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)) and Native Hawaiians (as defined in section 6207 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7517)).

(4) The private aerospace industry.

(5) The private earth observing industry.

(6) The operational forecasting community.

(7) The academic community.

(8) Professional societies that focus on meteorology.

(9) Such other stakeholder groups as the Under Secretary considers appropriate.

SA 5126. Mr. SULLIVAN (for Ms. CANTWELL) proposed an amendment to

amendment SA 5125 proposed by Mr. SULLIVAN (for Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. NELSON)) to the bill H.R. 1561, to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE —TSUNAMI WARNING, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2016
SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2016”.

SEC. 02. REFERENCES TO THE TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (Public Law 109-424; 33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

SEC. 03. EXPANSION OF PURPOSES OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.

Section 3 (33 U.S.C. 3202) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “research,” after “warnings.”;

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) to enhance and modernize the existing United States Tsunami Warning System to increase the accuracy of forecasts and warnings, to ensure full coverage of tsunami threats to the United States with a network of detection assets, and to reduce false alarms.”;

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) to improve and develop standards and guidelines for mapping, modeling, and assessment efforts to improve tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery.”;

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (8), respectively;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) to improve research efforts related to improving tsunami detection, forecasting, warnings, notification, mitigation, resiliency, response, outreach, and recovery.”;

(6) in paragraph (5), as redesignated—

(A) by striking “and increase” and inserting “, increase, and develop uniform standards and guidelines for”;

(B) by inserting “, including the warning signs of locally generated tsunami” after “approaching”;

(7) in paragraph (6), as redesignated, by striking “, including the Indian Ocean; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(8) by inserting after paragraph (6), as redesignated, the following:

“(7) to foster resilient communities in the face of tsunami and other similar coastal hazards; and”.

SEC. 04. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI FORECASTING AND WARNING PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (a) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(a)) is amended by striking “Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, and Gulf of Mexico region” and inserting “Atlantic

Ocean region, including the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico”.

(b) COMPONENTS.—Subsection (b) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “established” and inserting “supported or maintained”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (9) as paragraphs (8) through (10), respectively;

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively;

(4) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) to the degree practicable, maintain not less than 80 percent of the Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis buoy array at operational capacity to optimize data reliability.”.

(5) by amending paragraph (5), as redesignated by paragraph (3), to read as follows:

“(5) provide tsunami forecasting capability based on models and measurements, including tsunami inundation models and maps for use in increasing the preparedness of communities and safeguarding port and harbor operations, that incorporate inputs, including—

“(A) the United States and global ocean and coastal observing system;

“(B) the global Earth observing system;

“(C) the global seismic network;

“(D) the Advanced National Seismic system;

“(E) tsunami model validation using historical and paleotsunami data;

“(F) digital elevation models and bathymetry; and

“(G) newly developing tsunami detection methodologies using satellites and airborne remote sensing.”;

(6) by amending paragraph (7), as redesignated by paragraph (3), to read as follows:

“(7) include a cooperative effort among the Administration, the United States Geological Survey, and the National Science Foundation under which the Director of the United States Geological Survey and the Director of the National Science Foundation shall—

“(A) provide rapid and reliable seismic information to the Administrator from international and domestic seismic networks; and

“(B) support seismic stations installed before the date of the enactment of the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2016 to supplement coverage in areas of sparse instrumentation.”;

(7) in paragraph (8), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “, including graphical warning products,” after “warnings”;

(B) by inserting “, territories,” after “States”; and

(C) by inserting “and Wireless Emergency Alerts” after “Hazards Program”; and

(8) in paragraph (9), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “provide and” before “allow”; and

(B) by inserting “and commercial and Federal undersea communications cables” after “observing technologies”.

(c) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—Subsection (c) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—The program under this section shall operate a tsunami warning system that—

“(1) is capable of forecasting tsunami, including forecasting tsunami arrival time and inundation estimates, anywhere in the Pacific and Arctic Ocean regions and providing adequate warnings;

“(2) is capable of forecasting and providing adequate warnings, including tsunami arrival time and inundation models where ap-

plicable, in areas of the Atlantic Ocean, including the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico, that are determined—

“(A) to be geologically active, or to have significant potential for geological activity; and

“(B) to pose significant risks of tsunami for States along the coastal areas of the Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean Sea, or Gulf of Mexico; and

“(3) supports other international tsunami forecasting and warning efforts.”.

(d) TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.—Subsection (d) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) TSUNAMI WARNING CENTERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall support or maintain centers to support the tsunami warning system required by subsection (c). The Centers shall include—

“(A) the National Tsunami Warning Center, located in Alaska, which is primarily responsible for Alaska and the continental United States;

“(B) the Pacific Tsunami Warning Center, located in Hawaii, which is primarily responsible for Hawaii, the Caribbean, and other areas of the Pacific not covered by the National Center; and

“(C) any additional forecast and warning centers determined by the National Weather Service to be necessary.

“(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of the centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

“(A) Continuously monitoring data from seismological, deep ocean, coastal sea level, and tidal monitoring stations and other data sources as may be developed and deployed.

“(B) Evaluating earthquakes, landslides, and volcanic eruptions that have the potential to generate tsunami.

“(C) Evaluating deep ocean buoy data and tidal monitoring stations for indications of tsunami resulting from earthquakes and other sources.

“(D) To the extent practicable, utilizing a range of models, including ensemble models, to predict tsunami, including arrival times, flooding estimates, coastal and harbor currents, and duration.

“(E) Using data from the Integrated Ocean Observing System of the Administration in coordination with regional associations to calculate new inundation estimates and periodically update existing inundation estimates.

“(F) Disseminating forecasts and tsunami warning bulletins to Federal, State, tribal, and local government officials and the public.

“(G) Coordinating with the tsunami hazard mitigation program conducted under section 5 to ensure ongoing sharing of information between forecasters and emergency management officials.

“(H) In coordination with the Coast Guard, evaluating and recommending procedures for ports and harbors at risk of tsunami inundation, including review of readiness, response, and communication strategies, and data sharing policies, to the maximum extent practicable.

“(I) Making data gathered under this Act and post-warning analyses conducted by the National Weather Service or other relevant Administration offices available to the public.

“(J) Integrating and modernizing the program operated under this section with advances in tsunami science to improve performance without compromising service.

“(3) FAIL-SAFE WARNING CAPABILITY.—The tsunami warning centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1) shall maintain a fail-safe warning capability and perform back-up duties for each other.

“(4) COORDINATION WITH NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE.—The Administrator shall coordinate with the forecast offices of the National Weather Service, the centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1), and such program offices of the Administration as the Administrator or the coordinating committee, as established in section 5(d), consider appropriate to ensure that regional and local forecast offices—

“(A) have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings for the communities they serve;

“(B) leverage connections with local emergency management officials for optimally disseminating tsunami warnings and forecasts; and

“(C) implement mass communication tools in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act of 2016 used by the National Weather Service on such date and newer mass communication technologies as they are developed as a part of the Weather-Ready Nation program of the Administration, or otherwise, for the purpose of timely and effective delivery of tsunami warnings.

“(5) UNIFORM OPERATING PROCEDURES.—The Administrator shall—

“(A) develop uniform operational procedures for the centers supported or maintained under paragraph (1), including the use of software applications, checklists, decision support tools, and tsunami warning products that have been standardized across the program supported under this section;

“(B) ensure that processes and products of the warning system operated under subsection (c)—

“(i) reflect industry best practices when practicable;

“(ii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with internationally recognized standards for information technology; and

“(iii) conform to the maximum extent practicable with other warning products and practices of the National Weather Service;

“(C) ensure that future adjustments to operational protocols, processes, and warning products—

“(i) are made consistently across the warning system operated under subsection (c); and

“(ii) are applied in a uniform manner across such warning system;

“(D) establish a systematic method for information technology product development to improve long-term technology planning efforts; and

“(E) disseminate guidelines and metrics for evaluating and improving tsunami forecast models.

“(6) AVAILABLE RESOURCES.—The Administrator, through the National Weather Service, shall ensure that resources are available to fulfill the obligations of this Act. This includes ensuring supercomputing resources are available to run, as rapidly as possible, such computer models as are needed for purposes of the tsunami warning system operated under subsection (c).”.

(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—Subsection (e) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(e)) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY; MAINTENANCE AND UPGRADES.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall—

“(1) develop requirements for the equipment used to forecast tsunami, including—

“(A) provisions for multipurpose detection platforms;

“(B) reliability and performance metrics; and

“(C) to the maximum extent practicable, requirements for the integration of equipment with other United States and global ocean and coastal observation systems, the

global Earth observing system of systems, the global seismic networks, and the Advanced National Seismic System;

“(2) develop and execute a plan for the transfer of technology from ongoing research conducted as part of the program supported or maintained under section 6 into the program under this section; and

“(3) ensure that the Administration’s operational tsunami detection equipment is properly maintained.”

(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—Subsection (f) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) FEDERAL COOPERATION.—When deploying and maintaining tsunami detection technologies under the program under this section, the Administrator shall—

“(1) identify which assets of other Federal agencies are necessary to support such program; and

“(2) work with each agency identified under paragraph (1)—

“(A) to acquire the agency’s assistance; and

“(B) to prioritize the necessary assets in support of the tsunami forecast and warning program.”

(g) UNNECESSARY PROVISIONS.—Section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203) is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (g);

(2) by striking subsections (i) through (k); and

(3) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

(h) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATIONS.—Subsection (g) of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 3203(g)), as redesignated by subsection (g)(3), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and moving such subparagraphs 2 ems to the right;

(2) in the matter before subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking “The Administrator” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator”;

(3) in paragraph (1), as redesignated by paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

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

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the occurrence of a significant tsunami warning.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CONTENTS.—In a case in which notice is submitted under paragraph (1) within 30 days of a significant tsunami warning described in subparagraph (C) of such paragraph, such notice shall include, as appropriate, brief information and analysis of—

“(A) the accuracy of the tsunami model used;

“(B) the specific deep ocean or other monitoring equipment that detected the incident, as well as the deep ocean or other monitoring equipment that did not detect the incident due to malfunction or other reasons;

“(C) the effectiveness of the warning communication, including the dissemination of warnings with State, territory, local, and tribal partners in the affected area under the jurisdiction of the National Weather Service; and

“(D) such other findings as the Administrator considers appropriate.”

SEC. 05. MODIFICATION OF NATIONAL TSUNAMI HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(a) (33 U.S.C. 3204(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the heads of such other

agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, shall conduct a community-based tsunami hazard mitigation program to improve tsunami preparedness and resiliency of at-risk areas in the United States and the territories of the United States.”

(b) NATIONAL TSUNAMI HAZARD MITIGATION PROGRAM.—Section 5 (33 U.S.C. 3204) is amended by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

“(c) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—The Program conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

“(1) Technical and financial assistance to coastal States, territories, tribes, and local governments to develop and implement activities under this section.

“(2) Integration of tsunami preparedness and mitigation programs into ongoing State-based hazard warning, resilience planning, and risk management activities, including predisaster planning, emergency response, evacuation planning, disaster recovery, hazard mitigation, and community development and redevelopment planning programs in affected areas.

“(3) Activities to promote the adoption of tsunami resilience, preparedness, warning, and mitigation measures by Federal, State, territorial, tribal, and local governments and nongovernmental entities, including educational and risk communication programs to discourage development in high-risk areas.

“(4) Activities to support the development of regional tsunami hazard and risk assessments. Such regional risk assessments may include the following:

“(A) The sources, sizes, and other relevant historical data of tsunami in the region, including paleotsunami data.

“(B) Inundation models and maps of critical infrastructure and socioeconomic vulnerability in areas subject to tsunami inundation.

“(C) Maps of evacuation areas and evacuation routes, including, when appropriate, traffic studies that evaluate the viability of evacuation routes.

“(D) Evaluations of the size of populations that will require evacuation, including populations with special evacuation needs.

“(E) Evaluations and technical assistance for vertical evacuation structure planning for communities where models indicate limited or no ability for timely evacuation, especially in areas at risk of near shore generated tsunami.

“(F) Evaluation of at-risk ports and harbors.

“(G) Evaluation of the effect of tsunami currents on the foundations of closely-spaced, coastal high-rise structures.

(5) Activities to promote preparedness in at-risk ports and harbors, including the following:

“(A) Evaluation and recommendation of procedures for ports and harbors in the event of a distant or near-field tsunami.

“(B) A review of readiness, response, and communication strategies to ensure coordination and data sharing with the Coast Guard.

“(6) Activities to support the development of community-based outreach and education programs to ensure community readiness and resilience, including the following:

“(A) The development, implementation, and assessment of technical training and public education programs, including education programs that address unique characteristics of distant and near-field tsunami.

“(B) The development of decision support tools.

“(C) The incorporation of social science research into community readiness and resilience efforts.

“(D) The development of evidence-based education guidelines.

“(7) Dissemination of guidelines and standards for community planning, education, and training products, programs, and tools, including—

“(A) standards for—

“(i) mapping products;

“(ii) inundation models; and

“(iii) effective emergency exercises; and

“(B) recommended guidance for at-risk port and harbor tsunami warning, evacuation, and response procedures in coordination with the Coast Guard.

“(d) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—In addition to activities conducted under subsection (c), the program conducted under subsection (a) may include the following:

“(1) Multidisciplinary vulnerability assessment research, education, and training to help integrate risk management and resilience objectives with community development planning and policies.

“(2) Risk management training for local officials and community organizations to enhance understanding and preparedness.

“(3) Interagency, Federal, State, tribal, and territorial intergovernmental tsunami response exercise planning and implementation in high risk areas.

“(4) Development of practical applications for existing or emerging technologies, such as modeling, remote sensing, geospatial technology, engineering, and observing systems, including the integration of tsunami sensors into Federal and commercial submarine telecommunication cables if practicable.

“(5) Risk management, risk assessment, and resilience data and information services, including—

“(A) access to data and products derived from observing and detection systems; and

“(B) development and maintenance of new integrated data products to support risk management, risk assessment, and resilience programs.

“(6) Risk notification systems that coordinate with and build upon existing systems and actively engage decisionmakers, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments and agencies, business communities, nongovernmental organizations, and the media.

(e) NO PREEMPTION WITH RESPECT TO DESIGNATION OF AT-RISK AREAS.—The establishment of national standards for inundation models under this section shall not prevent States, territories, tribes, and local governments from designating additional areas as being at risk based on knowledge of local conditions.

(f) NO NEW REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act may be construed as establishing new regulatory authority for any Federal agency.”

(c) REPORT ON ACCREDITATION OF TSUNAMIREADY PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on which authorities and activities would be needed to have the TsunamiReady program of the National Weather Service accredited by the Emergency Management Accreditation Program.

SEC. 06. MODIFICATION OF TSUNAMI RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 6 (33 U.S.C. 3205) is amended—

(1) in the matter before paragraph (1), by striking “The Administrator shall” and all that follows through “establish or maintain” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall, in consultation with such other Federal agencies, State, tribal, and territorial

governments, and academic institutions as the Administrator considers appropriate, the coordinating committee under section 5(d), and the panel under section 8(a), support or maintain”;

(2) in subsection (a), as designated by paragraph (1), by striking “and assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling. Such research program shall—” and inserting the following: “assessment for tsunami tracking and numerical forecast modeling, and standards development.

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The research program supported or maintained under subsection (a) shall—”; and

(3) in subsection (b), as designated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) consider other appropriate and cost effective solutions to mitigate the impact of tsunami, including the improvement of near-field and distant tsunami detection and forecasting capabilities, which may include use of a new generation of the Deep-ocean Assessment and Reporting of Tsunamis array, integration of tsunami sensors into commercial and Federal telecommunications cables, and other real-time tsunami monitoring systems and supercomputer capacity of the Administration to develop a rapid tsunami forecast for all United States coastlines;”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “include” and inserting “conduct”; and

(ii) by striking “and” at the end;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5);

(D) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) develop the technical basis for validation of tsunami maps, numerical tsunami models, digital elevation models, and forecasts; and”;

(E) in paragraph (5), as redesignated by subparagraph (C), by striking “to the scientific community” and inserting “to the public and the scientific community”.

SEC. 07. GLOBAL TSUNAMI WARNING AND MITIGATION NETWORK.

Section 7 (33 U.S.C. 3206) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL TSUNAMI WARNING SYSTEM.—The Administrator shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State and in consultation with such other agencies as the Administrator considers relevant, provide technical assistance, operational support, and training to the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Meteorological Organization of the United Nations, and such other international entities as the Administrator considers appropriate, as part of the international efforts to develop a fully functional global tsunami forecast and warning system comprised of regional tsunami warning networks.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “shall” each place it appears and inserting “may”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “establishing” and inserting “supporting”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “establish” and inserting “support”; and

(ii) by striking “establishing” and inserting “supporting”.

SEC. 08. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Act is further amended—

(1) by redesignating section 8 (33 U.S.C. 3207) as section 9; and

(2) by inserting after section 7 (33 U.S.C. 3206) the following:

“SEC. 8. TSUNAMI SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL.

“(a) DESIGNATION.—The Administrator shall designate an existing working group within the Science Advisory Board of the Administration to serve as the Tsunami Science and Technology Advisory Panel to provide advice to the Administrator on matters regarding tsunami science, technology, and regional preparedness.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) COMPOSITION.—The Panel shall be composed of no fewer than 7 members selected by the Administrator from among individuals from academia or State agencies who have academic or practical expertise in physical sciences, social sciences, information technology, coastal resilience, emergency management, or such other disciplines as the Administrator considers appropriate.

“(2) FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT.—No member of the Panel may be a Federal employee.

“(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Panel shall—

“(1) review the activities of the Administration, and other Federal activities as appropriate, relating to tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation; and

“(2) submit to the Administrator and such others as the Administrator considers appropriate—

“(A) the findings of the working group with respect to the most recent review conducted under paragraph (1); and

“(B) such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the working group considers appropriate to improve Federal tsunami research, detection, forecasting, warning, mitigation, resiliency, and preparation.

“(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on the findings and recommendations received by the Administrator under subsection (c)(2).”.

SEC. 09. REPORTS.

(a) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TSUNAMI WARNING AND EDUCATION ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed description of the progress made in implementing sections 4(d)(6), 5(b)(6), and 6(b)(4) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act.

(B) A description of the ways that tsunami warnings and warning products issued by the Tsunami Forecasting and Warning Program established under section 4 of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203) can be standardized and streamlined with warnings and warning products for hurricanes, coastal storms, and other coastal flooding events.

(b) REPORT ON NATIONAL EFFORTS THAT SUPPORT RAPID RESPONSE FOLLOWING NEAR-SHORE TSUNAMI EVENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall jointly, in coordination with the Director of the United States Geological Survey, Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Chief

of the National Guard Bureau, and the heads of such other Federal agencies as the Administrator considers appropriate, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the national efforts in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act that support and facilitate rapid emergency response following a domestic near-shore tsunami event to better understand domestic effects of earthquake derived tsunami on people, infrastructure, and communities in the United States.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of scientific or other measurements collected on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act to quickly identify and quantify lost or degraded infrastructure or terrestrial formations.

(B) A description of scientific or other measurements that would be necessary to collect to quickly identify and quantify lost or degraded infrastructure or terrestrial formations.

(C) Identification and evaluation of Federal, State, local, tribal, territorial, and military first responder and search and rescue operation centers, bases, and other facilities as well as other critical response assets and infrastructure, including search and rescue aircraft, located within near-shore and distant tsunami inundation areas on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(D) An evaluation of near-shore tsunami response plans in areas described in subparagraph (C) in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, and how those response plans would be affected by the loss of search and rescue and first responder infrastructure described in such subparagraph.

(E) A description of redevelopment plans and reports in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act for communities in areas that are at high-risk for near-shore tsunami, as well identification of States or communities that do not have redevelopment plans.

(F) Recommendations to enhance near-shore tsunami preparedness and response plans, including recommended responder exercises, predisaster planning, and mitigation needs.

(G) Such other data and analysis information as the Administrator and the Secretary of Homeland Security consider appropriate.

(3) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 9 of the Act, as redesignated by section 8(a)(1) of this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) \$25,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, of which—

“(A) not less than 27 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year shall be for activities conducted at the State level under the tsunami hazard mitigation program under section 5; and

“(B) not less than 8 percent of the amount appropriated shall be for the tsunami research program under section 6.”.

SEC. 11. OUTREACH RESPONSIBILITIES.

The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in coordination with State and local emergency managers, shall develop and carry out formal outreach activities to improve tsunami education and awareness and foster the development of resilient communities. Outreach activities may include—

(1) the development of outreach plans to ensure the close integration of tsunami warning centers supported or maintained under section 4(d) of the Tsunami Warning and Education Act (33 U.S.C. 3203(d)) with local Weather Forecast Offices of the National Weather Service and emergency managers;

(2) working with appropriate local Weather Forecast Offices to ensure they have the technical knowledge and capability to disseminate tsunami warnings to the communities they serve; and

(3) evaluating the effectiveness of warnings and of coordination with local Weather Forecast Offices after significant tsunami events.

SEC. 12. REPEAL OF DUPLICATE PROVISIONS OF LAW.

(a) REPEAL.—The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-479) is amended by striking title VIII (relating to tsunami warning and education).

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal, or affect in any way, Public Law 109-424.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have five requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 1, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 1, 2016, at 1:45 p.m., in room S-216.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 1, 2016, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The Future of Counter-Terrorism Strategy."

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 1, 2016, at 2 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on December 1, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, "Examining Two GAO Reports regarding the Renewable Fuel Standard."

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent my intern, Jill

Goatcher, be given the privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**JUSTICE FOR ALL
REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016**

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House to accompany S. 2577.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 2577) entitled "An Act to protect crime victims' rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA and other forensic evidence samples to improve and expand the forensic science testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of forensic evidence, to provide post-conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to support accreditation efforts of forensic science laboratories and medical examiner offices, to address training and equipment needs, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes," do pass with an amendment.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment; and I ask unanimous consent that the motion be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

METROPOLITAN WEATHER HAZARDS PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 629, S. 2058.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2058) to require the Secretary of Commerce to maintain and operate at least one Doppler weather radar site within 55 miles of each city in the United States that has a population of more than 700,000 individuals, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Metropolitan Weather Hazards Protection Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. STUDY ON GAPS IN NEXRAD COVERAGE AND REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN TO ADDRESS SUCH GAPS.

(a) *STUDY ON GAPS IN NEXRAD COVERAGE.—*
(1) *IN GENERAL.—*Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall complete a study on gaps in the coverage of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service (known as "NEXRAD").

(2) *ELEMENTS.—*Under the study required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) identify areas in the United States with limited or no Next Generation Weather Radar coverage below 6,000 feet above ground level of the surrounding terrain;

(B) for the areas identified under subparagraph (A), Charlotte, North Carolina, and surrounding counties, central Washington State, northwest New Mexico, and Columbus, Ohio, and surrounding counties—

(i) identify the key weather effects for which prediction would improve with improved radar detection;

(ii) identify additional sources of observations for high impact weather that were available and operational for such areas on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (known as "TDWR"), air surveillance radars of the Federal Aviation Administration, and cooperative network observers; and

(iii) assess the feasibility and advisability of efforts to integrate and upgrade Federal radar capabilities in such areas that are not owned or controlled by of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including radar capabilities of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Defense;

(C) assess the feasibility and advisability of incorporating State-operated and other non-Federal radars into the operations of the National Weather Service;

(D) identify options to improve radar coverage in the areas identified under subparagraph (A); and

(E) estimate the cost of, and develop a timeline for, carrying out each of the options identified under subparagraph (D).

(3) *REPORT.—*Upon the completion of the study required by paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the study.

(b) *PLAN TO IMPROVE RADAR COVERAGE.—*Not later than 30 days after the completion of the study required by subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall develop and submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a plan to improve radar coverage in the areas identified under subsection (a)(2)(A) by integrating, and upgrading where practicable, additional observation solutions to improve hazardous weather detection and forecasting.

(c) *REQUIREMENT FOR THIRD-PARTY REVIEWS REGARDING PLAN TO IMPROVE RADAR COVERAGE.—*The Secretary shall seek third-party reviews on scientific methodology relating to, and the feasibility and advisability of, implementing the plan developed and submitted under subsection (b), including the extent to which warning and forecast services of the National Weather Service would be improved by additional Next Generation Weather Radar coverage.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn, the Burr substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, the title amendment be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 5123) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STUDY ON GAPS IN NEXRAD COVERAGE AND REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN TO ADDRESS SUCH GAPS.

(a) **STUDY ON GAPS IN NEXRAD COVERAGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall complete a study on gaps in the coverage of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service (referred to in this section as “NEXRAD”).

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—In conducting the study required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) identify areas in the United States with limited or no NEXRAD coverage below 6,000 feet above ground level of the surrounding terrain;

(B) for the areas identified under subparagraph (A)—

(i) identify the key weather effects for which prediction would improve with improved radar detection;

(ii) identify additional sources of observations for high impact weather that were available and operational for such areas on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, including Terminal Doppler Weather Radar (commonly known as “TDWR”), air surveillance radars of the Federal Aviation Administration, and cooperative network observers; and

(iii) assess the feasibility and advisability of efforts to integrate and upgrade Federal radar capabilities that are not owned or controlled by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including radar capabilities of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Defense;

(C) assess the feasibility and advisability of incorporating State-operated and other non-Federal radars into the operations of the National Weather Service;

(D) identify options to improve radar coverage in the areas identified under subparagraph (A); and

(E) estimate the cost of, and develop a timeline for, carrying out each of the options identified under subparagraph (D).

(3) **REPORT.**—Upon the completion of the study required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that includes the findings of the Secretary with respect to the study.

(b) **PLAN TO IMPROVE RADAR COVERAGE.**—Not later than 30 days after the completion of the study under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a plan to the congressional committees referred to in subsection (a)(3) for improving radar coverage in the areas identified under subsection (a)(2)(A) by integrating and upgrading, to the extent practicable, additional observation solutions to improve hazardous weather detection and forecasting.

(c) **REQUIREMENT FOR THIRD-PARTY REVIEWS REGARDING PLAN TO IMPROVE RADAR COVERAGE.**—The Secretary of Commerce shall seek third-party reviews on scientific methodology relating to, and the feasibility and advisability of, implementing the plan submitted under subsection (b), including the extent to which warning and forecast services of the National Weather Service would be improved by additional NEXRAD coverage.

The bill (S. 2058), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third read-

ing, was read the third time, and passed.

The amendment (No. 5124) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to study the coverage gaps of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service and to develop a plan for improving radar coverage and hazardous weather detection and forecasting.”

ALLOWING THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FAA TO ENTER INTO REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENTS FOR CERTAIN AIRPORT PROJECTS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6014 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 (H.R. 6014) to allow the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into reimbursable agreements for certain airport projects.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered 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 (H.R. 6014) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WEATHER RESEARCH AND FORECASTING INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1561 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 (H.R. 1561) to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Thune substitute amendment at the desk be considered, the Cantwell amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the Thune substitute amendment,

as amended, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered 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. 5126) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The amendment (No. 5125) in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1561), as amended, was passed.

HONORING THE MEMORIES AND LEGACIES OF THE 3 LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN THE ATTACK ON JULY 17, 2016, IN BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 606.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 606) honoring the memories and legacies of the 3 law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the attack on July 17, 2016, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, condemning that attack, and recognizing the heroism of law enforcement personnel and first responders.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 606) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 29, 2016, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

COLONEL DEMAS T. CRAW VA CLINIC

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3492, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3492) to designate the Traverse City VA Community-Based Outpatient Clinic

of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Traverse City, Michigan, as the "Colonel Demas T. Crow VA Clinic."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and 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. 3492) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:
S. 3492

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF COLONEL DEMAS T. CROW VA CLINIC IN TRAVERSE CITY, MICHIGAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Demas T. Crow was born on April 9, 1900, in Long Lake Township, Michigan.

(2) While residing in Traverse City, Michigan, Demas T. Crow enlisted in the United States Army at Columbus Barracks, Ohio, on April 18, 1918, and trained with the 12th Cavalry at Camp Stanley, Texas.

(3) Colonel Crow achieved the position of senior pilot and was awarded—

(A) the Medal of Honor for action in North Africa;

(B) the World War I Victory Medal;

(C) the World War II Victory Medal;

(D) the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal;

(E) the Mexican Service Medal;

(F) the American Defense Service Medal;

(G) the Purple Heart;

(H) the Royal Order of George I; and

(I) the Observer Badge.

(4) Colonel Crow's citation for the Medal of Honor said, "For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action above and beyond the call of duty. On November 8, 1942, near Port Lyautey, French Morocco, Col. Crow volunteered to accompany the leading wave of assault boats to the shore and pass through the enemy lines to locate the French commander with a view to suspending hostilities. This request was first refused as being too dangerous but upon the officer's insistence that he was qualified to undertake and accomplish the mission he was allowed to go. Encountering heavy fire while in the landing boat and unable to dock in the river because of shell fire from shore batteries, Col. Crow, accompanied by 1 officer and 1 soldier, succeeded in landing on the beach at Mehdiya Plage under constant low-level strafing from 3 enemy planes. Riding in a bantam truck toward French headquarters, progress of the

party was hindered by fire from our own naval guns. Nearing Port Lyautey, Col. Crow was instantly killed by a sustained burst of machinegun fire at pointblank range from a concealed position near the road."

(5) Colonel Crow was killed in action on November 8, 1942, while attempting to deliver a message to broker a cease fire with France.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The Traverse City VA Community-Based Outpatient Clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Traverse City, Michigan, shall after the date of the enactment of this Act be known and designated as the "Colonel Demas T. Crow VA Clinic".

(c) REFERENCE.—Any reference in any law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the community-based outpatient clinic referred to in subsection (b) shall be considered to be a reference to the Colonel Demas T. Crow VA Clinic.

NATIONAL PHENYLKETONURIA AWARENESS DAY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 627, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 627) designating December 3, 2016, as "National Phenylketonuria Awareness Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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. 627) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A REVISED EDITION OF THE SENATE RULES AND MANUAL

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 628, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 628) authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to 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 resolution (S. Res. 628) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2016

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, December 5; 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 leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 34; further, that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments under rule XXII for the cloture motion filed during today's session be 4 p.m., Monday, December 5; finally, that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2016, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:07 p.m., adjourned until Monday, December 5, 2016, at 3 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REAFFIRMING LONGSTANDING UNITED STATES POLICY IN SUPPORT OF A DIRECT BILATERALLY NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

SPEECH OF

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 29, 2016

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and chairman for their hard work in crafting this resolution. It reiterates a number of points consistent with longstanding U.S. policy on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, including the current Administration, that I support. It is still to be seen what this policy will look like under the new Administration.

No one disputes the need for the parties to directly work out the issues. I articulated that position in a letter I sent to President Obama when he took office in 2009. I reaffirmed that position again in a letter to the President about a year ago. I continue to support that position.

Additionally, no one disputes the need to oppose unilateral actions by either party that undermines the process. As Vice President BIDEN noted earlier this year, "Actions on either side to undermine trust only take us further away from the path of peace. Actions like at the U.N. to undermine Israel, or . . . settlement activities." Such actions clearly erode the prospect of a two-state solution, the stated goal for U.S. policy and efforts for a number of years now.

However, I believe that this resolution we are debating is incomplete.

For example, this resolution should not be mischaracterized or misrepresented as opposing constructive steps by the United States, either unilaterally or with the international community, to help preserve and further a negotiated two-state solution between the Israelis and Palestinians.

While no effort can replace the parties themselves reaching agreement, there are a host of ways in which the U.S. and other stakeholders in the international communities, like Arab countries in the region, with a vital interest in peace can support steps to rebuild trust and good will, both of which are sorely lacking and will be needed. It must be made clear that Congress is not discouraging such efforts through this or any other resolution.

The framework for a resolution to the conflict has long been clear for a number of years and formulated a number of times, including President Clinton and President George W. Bush. No U.N. resolution is needed for that.

The issue isn't whether we know where the major issues of disagreement lie, but how to create an environment that encourages the parties to move forward. The U.S. and international support can be helpful and useful to building that environment. It would be foolhardy to hope that somehow the Israelis and

Palestinians spontaneously decide to stop pointing fingers and come together and find solutions to some very tough and challenging issues.

The challenges to peace at the moment are tremendous which is why it is important that we should encourage all interested in peace to continue to work for it.

Even Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu recently expressed appreciation for and a willingness to build on multilateral and regional efforts regarding the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians, such as the Arab Peace Initiative.

At the end of his Administration, President George W. Bush held a conference at Annapolis where he hosted the leaders of Israel and the Palestinian Authority, but also other "nations that support a two-state solution, reject violence, recognize Israel's right to exist, and commit to all previous agreements between the parties." President Bush also noted that "the world can do more to build the conditions for peace" between the two parties. The U.S. invited 49 countries and international organizations to participate including Members of the Arab League, Permanent Members of the U.N. Security Council, and the International Quartet for Middle East Peace.

In 2007, President George W. Bush argued for the international community to "rise to the moment, and provide decisive support to responsible Palestinian leaders working for peace" and laid out one role for the international community—helping create viable Palestinian institutions necessary for a state.

Former Senator and head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Richard Lugar repeatedly noted that "Both Israel and the Palestinians urgently need international support to fortify their ability and willingness to embrace the difficult choices that will be necessary" to reach a peace deal.

While the world has changed much since that time, the need for the international community to do more to "build conditions for peace" between the two parties has not diminished.

Yet, I am concerned that some may read H. Con. Res. 165 as dismissing all efforts by the U.S. to engage the international community to galvanize broad support for meaningful efforts to move the parties towards peace.

I also want to emphasize that no one should read this resolution as preventing the U.S. from supporting non-binding efforts through the U.N. Security Council to further progress toward a negotiated, conflict-ending agreement. This has long been a part of the U.S. Middle East Peace toolbox.

The U.S. was instrumental in drafting and passing UNSC Resolutions 242 (in 1967) and 338 (in 1973) outlining the international community's desire for a peaceful resolution to the Arab-Israeli conflict through territorial compromise. Democratic and Republican Presidents alike have previously worked through the U.N. Security Council to promote peace.

Under President Reagan, the United States did not veto U.N. Security Council Resolutions

criticizing Israel's annexation of the Golan Heights and its activities in the occupied Palestinian territories.

I believe that such efforts remain a viable tool today.

That doesn't mean the U.S. has to support efforts it believes are contrary to peace. It has long been U.S. policy to denounce actions by any party—Israel, the Palestinians, or international actors—that are unwelcomed. This includes opposition to actions by the United Nations—or any other entity—to pass resolutions that are one-sided or anti-Israel. And the Obama Administration has done so when needed.

Additionally, I believe the resolution would have been strengthened by strongly emphasizing that there is no workable alternative to the two-state solution which has been the focus of U.S. peacemaking efforts for years now.

Lastly, I continue to support the current Administration's push for peace between our allies and to urge it to continue to do so even in its waning days. I also urge the incoming Administration to work constructively towards a two-state solution. In a recent poll, 69 percent of American Jewish voters expressed support for President Barack Obama delivering a major speech before leaving office outlining a vision for what Israelis and Palestinians must do to reach a peace agreement.

There is plenty of blame to apportion for why the status quo of violence, instability, and conflict continues unabated.

We owe it to every Israeli and Palestinian who share a vision of two peoples living side by side in peace and security to never quit on working toward a meaningful peace and that should include pursuing every tool and leveraging every ally in that pursuit.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID JOHNSON, CO-FOUNDER OF POLARIS INDUSTRIES

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a visionary business man from my district, David Johnson. He co-founded Polaris Industries and designed its first snowmobile.

While Mr. Johnson was in the Navy he invested half of his paycheck . . . just \$11 after he received a letter from his friend asking for help. When he returned home after his military service Mr. Johnson went to work for the company.

The company he helped found reached its first billion-dollar sales year in 1995. It now generates over \$4 billion in sales yearly and has a major impact on the local economy.

Despite retiring in 1988, Mr Johnson was a regular fixture at the company's Roseau, Minnesota plant, which is in my district. He would

• 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.

check in on the newer models the company was producing and he would also give tours and share stories about company history.

Mr. Johnson was a lifelong snowmobile rider. For his 90th birthday, he took a three-day 150 mile ride aboard a Polaris snowmobile from Roseau to his old cabin in the Northwest angle.

Mr. Johnson was inducted into the snowmobile Hall of Fame in 1999. Mr. Johnson died in his Roseau MN home after a long illness. He was 93 years old.

David Johnson is survived by his wife of 68 years, Eleanor, and their children, Rodney, Mary, Mitchell, and Aaron. All Polaris employees were honorary pallbearers for his funeral service.

It was my sincere pleasure to know David Johnson and to work with him.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life and achievements of David Johnson.

TRIBUTE TO STAFF SERGEANT
CLAYTON E. MONEYMAKER

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and military service of Staff Sergeant Clayton E. Moneymaker, who, after service in the U.S. Army during World War II, dedicated 41 years of his life to the service of veterans in the Huntsville-Madison County community and the State of Alabama.

Clayton Eugene Moneymaker was born on January 1, 1918 in Heysworth, Illinois to Mr. and Mrs. Lee Moneymaker. On August 10, 1943, at 25 years old, Clayton joined the U.S. Army and officially entered active military service on August 31, 1943. Clayton served honorably, and on January 8, 1946, separated from the Army having attained the rank of Staff Sergeant.

In 1981, Clayton mortgaged his home to complete the purchase, construction, and completion of the new home for the Huntsville-Madison County American Legion Post 237.

Clayton served his fellow veterans from 1982 to 2011 in numerous positions including as the American Legion Department of Alabama Commander, the District 12 Commander, the Division 1 Commander, and twice he served as the American Legion Post 237 Commander, spanning 19 years.

In recognition of his dedication to veterans in our community, the American Legion Post 237 membership, living heirs of Clayton, the American Legion Department of Alabama, and the National Headquarters of the American Legion all agreed to rename the Huntsville-Madison County American Legion Post 237 as the Clayton E. Moneymaker American Legion Post 237.

Clayton Eugene Moneymaker dedicated 41 years of his life to serving veterans in the Huntsville-Madison County community and the State of Alabama.

Today I pay tribute to an extraordinary individual, Clayton E. Moneymaker, and express my sincere gratitude for his life of committed service to the veterans of Alabama.

HONORING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF GRACE HEALTH CLINIC AND THE LEADERSHIP OF DR. RANDY HICKLE

HON. RANDY NEUGEBAUER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 10th anniversary of Grace Health Clinic in Lubbock, Texas. I would also like to honor Grace Health Clinic's founder and CEO, Dr. Randy Hickle, and recognize his commitment to providing quality, service and value to the countless families throughout the South Plains.

To appreciate this accomplishment, one must understand the humble beginnings from which Grace Health Clinic came.

Dr. Hickle founded Grace Clinic in 2006 with just eight doctors on staff. Under his guidance, Grace Health Clinic has transformed into Grace Health System, growing to more than 50 doctors and specialists and expanding its operations to better serve their patients' needs.

The award-winning clinic is the only locally owned, doctor-operated health facility in the region. Thanks to the tireless efforts of Dr. Hickle, Grace Health Clinic has been able to grow without losing its focus on patients and their healthcare needs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize a clinic that has contributed so much to our community. It is my pleasure to take this opportunity and praise the vision that Dr. Hickle had when he founded this clinic 10 years ago and the leadership he has exhibited throughout this journey.

RECOGNIZING MR. WILLIAM
"BILL" HALD

HON. DOUG LaMALFA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. William "Bill" Hald of Grass Valley, California, an artist and a veteran from the North State.

Bill served in the United States Navy from 1967 through 1973. After graduating 2nd in his class, he served as a computer fire control missile technician aboard the USS *Ramsey*, a *Brooke*-class destroyer escort for the USS *Hancock* aircraft carrier in the Western Pacific. Mr. Hald was one of the six crewmembers required to use the *Ramsey's* Tartar Missile System—but during his first tour he was the sole technician able to use the system's analog computer, resulting in long days and nights. Throughout his tour in the Western Pacific, the USS *Ramsey* earned 5 Battle Stars in addition to a number of citations and campaign ribbons. After his service, Bill returned to the North State and began to sculpt, sometimes using patriotic symbols, such as the bald eagle.

Bill's wife Camille placed one of his sculptures, *We The People*, up for the 2016 National Veterans Administration Creative Arts Competition. This annual competition focuses on the use of the creative arts to assist in re-

habilitative treatment for enrolled Veterans recovering from, and coping with physical and emotional disabilities. The competition has 51 categories, including sculptures. *We The People* quickly gained recognition, placing first in local and regional competitions. On October 16, 2016, at the National Veterans Creative Arts Festival in Jackson, Mississippi, *We The People* won first place in the sculpture category.

We The People portrays a bald eagle perched atop four books: the Holy Bible, on top, followed by three books labelled Legislative, Executive and Judicial to represent the first three Articles of the Constitution of the United States. The right talon of the eagle is placed on the Holy Bible, while it stands "on the wall," over the Constitution in a protective stance. In total, Bill spent over a year crafting the 100 pound pure bronze sculpture in his garage. There are 5,000 accurately handcrafted feathers on the piece. I am deeply grateful to Bill for his service in the United States Navy, but also for the incredible devotion and patriotism that he has shown to his country after his service ended.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE R. GROSSE OF JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of The Honorable George R. Grosse. We in Jacksonville, Florida, mourned Mr. Grosse's passing after 86 years of life on June 3, 2016.

Born in Jacksonville, Florida, in 1930, George dedicated his life to his faith, his family and his community. He graduated from Baldwin High School and was a lifelong resident of Jacksonville's Westside. George became an accomplished businessman, a successful law enforcement official, and a public servant who enjoyed a reputation for honesty, fair dealings, and a strong Christian faith. He was a member of Westside Baptist Church where he served as a Deacon for more than 25 years.

George always held an entrepreneurial spirit, a strong work ethic, and the American Dream in his heart. He started a chicken farm and later became a journeyman carpenter. Then in 1957, George joined the Duval County Road Patrol as a Deputy Sheriff. In 1968, he was elected President of the Duval County Fraternal Order of Police Lodge Number 30. Then, when the city and the county consolidated, he was elected as the first President of the consolidated FOP Lodge Number 5-30 and was selected as Officer of the Year for the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office. He continued to serve as FOP President until he left JSO in 1970 to devote his full attention to Gateway Concrete Contractors, Inc., a concrete business he founded and which he ultimately grew to be the largest concrete contractor of its day in Northeast Florida.

In 1973, George was elected to the Florida House of Representatives for District 15. He represented West Duval County, as well as all of Baker, Nassau and Union counties for three terms. I had the privilege of serving with him

in the State House for several years and considered him a valued friend and colleague. George resigned his seat in 1977, when President Jimmy Carter appointed him as the U.S. Marshall for the Middle District of Florida, a role he served in until 1982. Later he was appointed by Mayor Jake Godbold to the Jacksonville Electric Authority Board of Directors and was, subsequently, elected Board Chairman.

George was a role model to many and a well-respected leader of our community. He was recognized on several occasions for his active role in the leadership of the Boy Scouts of America's Great Northern District. In addition, he maintained an active role and presence in local politics his entire life. Each year, George and his wife Corene hosted a bar-b-que at their farm in support of my candidacy for Congress. I was never sure if people came out to see me or George. He dedicated his life to the service of others and his generosity of spirit and warm affability endeared him to his family, his friends and his neighbors. I send my heartfelt condolences to his family and join with all of Jacksonville in mourning our loss.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in celebrating the outstanding life of one of Florida's and Jacksonville's most outstanding citizens, The Honorable George R. Grosse.

REMEMBRANCE AND HOPE ON
WORLD AIDS DAY

HON. JAMES A. HIMES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, today, December 1, 2016, marks the 28th World AIDS Day—a day to come together in support of people around the world who live with HIV/AIDS, to remember those we've lost, and to commit ourselves to eradicating this vile disease once and for all.

For me, this day conjures back a memory I have of visiting the Names Project AIDS Memorial Quilt on the National Mall on a sweltering day in Washington a few summers ago. Although I was sweating through my suit, it was impossible not to stand there without being profoundly moved. I was moved when I thought about the fathers, mothers, cousins, sisters, brothers, friends, and other loved ones whose lives were cut short by this wretched disease—many of whom had their stories memorialized on a panel of the AIDS quilt for the world to see. Stories like that of Ryan White, an Indiana teenager who was diagnosed with HIV in 1984 after receiving a contaminated blood treatment for Hemophilia. Just 13 years old, Ryan was barred from returning to school, cast asunder by a society that did not yet comprehend that the disease transmits independently of lifestyle. But he spent the rest of his young life advocating for understanding and against an unjust stigma, finally perishing far too young at 18. Countless stories like Ryan's are a reminder that we must never forget how far we've come, and how far we have left to go.

That said, we've made tremendous progress since the first World AIDS Day in 1988. So many people today are alive because of the investment, hard work, activism and commitment of those who fought for this progress,

like Ryan—for housing, for prevention, for a fair shake for those who today live with this wretched disease.

In Congress, I have worked with my colleagues on the Congressional HIV/AIDS caucus to support policies that promote research, prevention, and, most importantly, a cure. Through my work with these magnificent colleagues—many of whom have been fighting this battle since long before I dreamed of running for Congress—I have resolved that we must fully fund programs that fight AIDS at home and abroad. Programs like the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria—both of which provide antiretroviral HIV treatments and screenings to millions of children and adults around the world. And the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS—a program that allows Americans with AIDS to access subsidized, low-income housing.

Today, our government has made stopping the proliferation of HIV/AIDS a priority, and the impact is real. Last year, the U.S. government spent \$26.42 billion on HIV/AIDS treatment, prevention, and accommodations domestically, and \$6.57 billion for international programs. Between 2005 and 2014, the annual total of new cases has fallen 19 percent largely due to increased screenings and prevention measures. Even still, the lifetime cost of treating an HIV infection is \$379,000—a staggering amount considering that 30 percent of those living with the disease lack health insurance.

I am especially pleased by news that the National Institutes of Health started a grant program in July of this year to fund research into a cure—\$30 million per year over the next five years. amFAR, a non-profit research organization, has committed to investing \$100 million to form the scientific basis for a cure by 2020.

The scientists tell us the moment is now. A cure is possible if we commit ourselves to it. As long as I am in Congress, I will fight to make the necessary resources available to eradicate HIV/AIDS and realize our shared dream of an AIDS-free generation.

IN HONOR OF DAVE POTTER

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dave Potter, a model public servant on this memorable occasion of his retirement from the Monterey County Board of Supervisors. I have had the tremendous pleasure in working with Dave over the years and the great honor to call him a dear friend.

Dave originally hails from Hingham, Massachusetts. In 1970, his van broke down on Highway 1 near Carmel and he just stayed and made the Monterey Peninsula his home. Starting in the early 70s, he built a general contracting business, Potter Construction. That work soon led him into the world of public policy as an appointee to the City of Monterey's Architectural Review Committee and then Planning Commission and ultimately to an elected seat on the Monterey City Council.

In 1996, Dave was elected to the Monterey County Board of Supervisors to represent the

Fifth District, the same supervisorial district I represented from 1975 to 1980. He quickly gained a reputation on the Board as a doer, a leader who got stuff done. The Carmel Hill Highway 1 climbing lane is a good example, and one that many of us use on a daily basis. And then there were countless other tasks and efforts that made life in the Fifth District that much better: resolution to a parking problem, a new park, viable ambulance service, assistance with County Planning, etc. His service stood out particularly in response to disasters both small and large. During the 2008 Basin Complex Fire and this year's Sobranes Fire, Dave and his office were ever present in the thick of the action helping the community and incident command resolve countless issues that came up on an almost daily basis. This kind of service won Dave reelection in 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2012.

During his tenure on the Board, Dave served on many boards, committees and commissions including the California Coastal Commission for 12 years, Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, Fort Ord Reuse Authority, Legislative Committee, Fort Ord Committee, Capital Improvements Committee, Natividad Medical Center Board of Trustees, Chair of Transportation Agency for Monterey County, and Chair of the Rail Policy Committee. In addition, Dave received numerous awards of recognition from 1980 through 2015 from a multitude of local cities and organizations, Chambers of Commerce, including resolutions from California State Senate and Congress representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the whole House in thanking Supervisor Potter for his many years of dedicated public service. I want to especially thank Dave's wife Janine and his three adult children Myles, Tyler, and Sarah, and grandchildren, Ciara and Bella for lending their husband, father, and grandfather to the people of this community. As a resident myself of the Fifth District, I know that my neighbors and I owe him a deep gratitude for doing so much to improve our quality of life. The world is a better place because of his efforts.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S BELOVED WILLIAM LEE "BILL" SUTLER

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and legacy of Northwest Florida's beloved William Lee "Bill" Sutler, who passed away on November 24, 2016. His love for his family and community, as well as his dedicated service in the United States Navy, will be remembered by all those who knew him.

Bill was born August 31, 1932, in Stanton, Virginia where he grew up with his mother and two sisters. At the young age of 17, Bill made the choice to serve our Nation by joining the United States Navy, serving faithfully and honorably for the next 26 years. Bill utilized his talents as an aircraft mechanic aboard several ships including the USS *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, USS *Saratoga*, USS *Constellation*, and the

USS *John F. Kennedy*. Chief Petty Officer Sutler also worked on aircrafts VF-11, VF-31, VF-121, and the RVAH-11. In 1974, after 26 years of service, he retired as a Senior Chief Petty Officer. After retirement, Bill continued his career by working for the state agriculture department and remained active in both Pineview Methodist Church and his community.

Those who knew Bill, know that he was a kind, generous, and smart man. He will always be remembered fondly for the unwavering love that he held for his family and his country.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize the life of William Lee "Bill" Sutler. My wife Vicki and I extend our heartfelt prayers and condolences to his wife Shirley "Colleen" Sutler; sons, William Jr. "Billy" and Virginia Sutler, Michael and Cheryl Sutler, and Robert "Bobby" and Diane Sutler; six grandchildren, Penny, Jennifer, Emily, Emmett, and Caleb Sutler, and Amanda Bell; and two great-grandchildren.

HONORING DEPUTY COMMANDER
PAT CAROTHERS

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, nearly two weeks ago, our nation lost another dedicated public servant committed to protecting our neighborhoods from criminals.

Deputy Commander Pat Carothers of the Southeast Regional Fugitive Task Force died in the line of duty while executing an arrest warrant for a fugitive wanted for attempted murder of police officers and domestic violence.

Deputy Commander Carothers served in the U.S. Marshals Service for 26 years. He was a native of Luray, Virginia, in the Sixth Congressional District which I represent, and spent his career serving the Northern District of Georgia. For over a quarter of a century, he risked his life every day to arrest fugitives of the law and see them brought to justice for their crimes.

In addition to wearing the badge, Deputy Commander Carothers was also a family man. He was married to his wife Terry for 30 years and was a loving father to five children. As the Carothers family mourns their devastating loss, we pray that God would comfort them and give them peace.

The murder of Deputy Commander Carothers reminds us once again that law enforcement officers face danger every day while on duty, whether simply knocking on a door or pulling someone over.

In 2016 alone, 132 law enforcement officers died in the line of duty. Attacks on those who protect our neighborhoods from criminals and keep the peace are not to be tolerated. I—and others in Congress—stand shoulder to shoulder with our nation's law enforcement officers and remain committed to finding solutions to reduce violence and aggression towards them.

In the Gospel of John, we are told that there is no greater love than to lay down one's life for one's friends. And this is true of Deputy Commander Carothers. Every day he risked his life so that others would be safe from harm. He is a hero and deserves to be recog-

nized and honored for his service to our country.

CELEBRATING THE TOWN OF
WESTBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the town of Westborough, Massachusetts as they enter the year of their 300th anniversary. Westborough was the 100th town to be incorporated in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on November 18th, 1717. Westborough has had an impressive history.

Forty-six Minutemen left Westborough on April 19, 1775 under the command of Captain Edmund Brigham to fight in the opening battle of the Revolutionary War. In the early 1800s, Westborough became a key stop as travelers to and from Worcester and Boston stopped along their journey.

Today, Westborough is a vibrant, thriving, and diverse town with an excellent school system and a family-oriented community. Westborough has been named "one of the best places to live" and a "top ten best town for families."

Westborough's location at the center of Massachusetts has helped propel its thriving local economy. Westborough has many unique family-owned small businesses and is home to the headquarters of some of New England's most notable companies.

Congratulations, again, to the town of Westborough. As Westborough looks ahead to the next 300 years, I am proud to join so many in wishing them a bright and prosperous future.

TRIBUTE TO WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
POLICE OFFICER
COLLIN ROSE

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to commemorate the life of Wayne State University police officer Collin Rose, who was killed in the line of duty on November 23, 2016. Officer Rose was my constituent, and lived in St. Clair Shores, Michigan.

A K9 officer with the Wayne State University Police Department in Detroit, Officer Rose not only protected the faculty, staff and student body at the University, but also the community surrounding Wayne State's campus. He was known to his friends and colleagues as a person of boundless energy, for his commitment to the safety of those he was sworn to serve, and for his kindness and generosity to others. A fellow member of the Wayne State University Police Department, Chris Powell, described Officer Rose as ". . . the light of the room. He was bears to honey. Everyone would befriend him."

As a memorial bicyclist with Chapter One of the Police Unity Tour, Officer Rose proudly honored police officers throughout the country

who died in the line of duty. In addition to helping to broaden public awareness of the sacrifices made by fallen officers, Officer Rose and other Unity Tour participants throughout the nation have helped to raise millions of dollars for the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund and the National Law Enforcement Museum. An avid cyclist, Officer Rose proposed to his fiancée, Nikki Salgot, after completing the last leg of the Police Unity Tour on May 12th of this year.

A 13-year old boy, Kameron Greene, who lives near Wayne State and who came to know Officer Rose though his consistent outreach to young people in the neighborhood, told WXYZ-TV in Detroit, "It's sad that he lost his life, and we lost a good friend." So with profound sadness at his loss and deep gratitude for his service, I encourage my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Officer Collin Rose, who was indeed a good friend to so many people, and in offering sincere condolences to Officer Rose's fiancée, Nikki Salgot; to his parents, Randy and Karen Rose and his brother Curtis Rose; to his colleagues with the Wayne State Police Department; and to the Wayne State community.

HONORING REVEREND FRANK E.
COLEMAN JR.

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as Messiah Baptist Church in Yonkers celebrates the installation of a new Pastor, I wanted to take the opportunity to congratulate and welcome the congregation's new leader, Westchester's own Reverend Frank E. Coleman Jr.

A graduate of Tuckahoe High School, Rev. Coleman attended Virginia Union University where he graduated with a B.A. in Religion & Philosophy. Later he graduated from Almeda University where he received his Master's degree in Pastoral Studies.

Rev. Coleman began his Pastoral career at Zion Baptist Church in Westmoreland, Virginia, before moving back to Westchester as Pastor of Shiloh Baptist Church in Tuckahoe. In 2010, he once again returned to Virginia as Pastor of the First Baptist Church in South Boston and remained there until 2014, when he once again returned home to Westchester. Since September, 2015 Rev. Coleman has served as Pastor-Elect of the Mother Church, The Messiah Baptist Church in Yonkers, New York.

In addition to his Pastoral duties, Rev. Coleman has left a lasting legacy of helping others everywhere he goes. He was the Vice President of the Halifax County Substance Abuse Awareness Coalition, Commissioner of The Southside Planning District Commission, Board Member of The Department of Social Services in Halifax, member of the S.C.L.C., Danville Branch and he served as the President of the Halifax/South Boston NAACP. He has also served as V.P. of the Tuckahoe School District's school board, Member of the Tuckahoe Village's Ethics Board and Co-Founder/President of the Committee Worker for All Children (CWAC).

Of course, Rev. Coleman's true love has always been family. He is the husband of the

Rev. Margaret Fountain Coleman of Mount Vernon New York and the father of one son and three daughters.

I am honored to help welcome Rev. Coleman to Messiah Baptist and I wish him nothing but the best in his tenure.

HONORING U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS SAINT PAUL DISTRICT ON 150 YEARS

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Saint Paul District on 150 years of service to residents of Minnesota and the entire upper Mississippi region. The Saint Paul district has, over the past century-and-a-half, conserved our aquatic habitats, managed the effects of drought and flood damage, provided outdoor recreation areas for the public, and ensured that the products and services produced in our region have the ability to be transported safely via our waterways. This is only to name a few of the critical tasks performed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Saint Paul District.

The Saint Paul District celebrates its birthday on August 17th every year because it was on that day in 1866 that Major General G.K. Warren, a West Point Graduate acclaimed for his leadership in the battle of Gettysburg, arrived in Saint Paul. His orders were seemingly modest: To establish an engineering office. He could not have known at the time, but the office that he established would go on to be entwined with the economy and history of the entire region. The first emergency that the St. Paul District responded to was the collapse of the Eastman Tunnel of Nicollet Island in Minneapolis. With expertise and precision, the Saint Paul district constructed structures to save both the island and nearby St. Anthony Falls. The structures that they built are still in use to this day.

Later on its history, the Saint Paul District supported the nation's mobilization during World War II. The Saint Paul District dredged the Minnesota River to the Port of Cargill, where Minnesota-based Cargill was building ships for the war effort. In addition, they also built an ordnance plant in Arden Hills, Minnesota, and airports in Fargo and Devil's Lake, North Dakota.

Today, any visit to the Mississippi River in St. Paul, showcases the work that the Saint Paul District does. The 13 locks and dams, and 9 foot navigation channel that the Saint Paul District operates and maintains, goes to support economically crucial inland navigation that benefits the entire upper Mississippi region. One of the most important tasks that the Saint Paul District has is to help communities combat the effects of flooding through disaster support and by the construction of flood risk management projects. This includes 16 large reservoirs for flood risk reduction that also offer recreation and fish and wildlife habitat. Another little known operation of the Saint Paul District is the operation of 49 separate recreation areas open to the public.

The Saint Paul District has supported the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District, and thousands of people in the upper Mis-

issippi River region for 150 years. Every task that they undertake goes to benefit the people they serve by strengthening the local economy, enabling the movement of goods and people, maintaining and restoring natural aquatic ecosystems, and reducing and preventing the effects of floods and droughts. Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the Saint Paul District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on 150 years of service.

USS "JOHN P. MURTHA" (LPD-26)

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the commissioning of the USS *John P. Murtha*, the new naval vessel named in honor of the late Congressman Jack Murtha, who will fondly be remembered as a decorated combat Marine, statesman, and dear friend to colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

On Saturday, October 8, 2016 in Philadelphia, PA, the Navy's 10th *San Antonio*-class amphibious transport dock, named the USS *John P. Murtha* (LPD 26), was commissioned by his beloved widow Mrs. Joyce Murtha and daughter Ms. Donna Murtha.

During his 58 years of service to our nation, 38 in the U.S. Marine Corps and 35 as a Member of U.S. Congress from Johnstown, PA, Rep. Murtha was an indefatigable champion for the Armed Services, rising in 1989 to chair the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. His detailed knowledge of the U.S. military, deep friendships across the various services, respect from his Congressional colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and wry sense of humor drew people to him and made him a highly effective lawmaker. Jack was a father of three children, the first Vietnam War combat veteran elected to Congress, recipient of the John F. Kennedy Profile in Courage Award, and staunch representative of his people. His own wartime experience as a battalion staff officer in Vietnam, where he was awarded the Bronze Star, two Purple Hearts, and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry, gave him deep insight into the political and military complexities of modern warfare.

An author, From Vietnam to 9/11: On the Front Lines of National Security with a New Epilogue on the Iraq War, he wrote: The Congress—the people's branch of government—has an obligation to make an independent assessment of key foreign policy issues. The way we go about collecting, analyzing, and using intelligence information is one of the most important determinants of our success or failure in world events. Unfortunately, it is a lesson we have had to learn too often, at a heavy price in American blood and treasure. What is certain, is that intelligence must always be used as a tool of statecraft, not as a political tool.

As this ship performs its missions on behalf of the American people, I have full confidence Jack Murtha's patriotic and strong spirit—Semper Fidelis—will be guiding the vessel if it encounters troubled waters as it navigates toward fair winds and following seas.

I include in the RECORD the remarks of Democratic Leader NANCY PELOSI given at the commissioning of the USS *John P. Murtha*.

PELOSI REMARKS AT USS JOHN P. MURTHA COMMISSIONING CEREMONY

PHILADELPHIA.—House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi delivered remarks today, October 8, 2016, at the commission ceremony of the USS John P. Murtha. Below are the Leader's remarks:

"Good morning. Thank you very much, Admiral William Moran for your kind introduction but more importantly, for your great leadership. As one that grew up in Baltimore, Maryland, I have a great loyalty to the Naval Academy, so I appreciate your comments about the Navy—but I had four brothers who served in the Army so . . .

[Laughter and applause]

"It is an honor to be with you today, with Secretary Valdez—please give our regards to Secretary Mabus—to Major General Christopher Owens—it is a proud day for all of us to come together for the Navy and the Marine Corps, for the Commissioning of the USS John P. Murtha.

"Chairman Murtha—as you have heard—was a legislator of unsurpassed talents, a soldier of extraordinary courage and a public servant to the end. Mr. Brady—my colleague, Congressman Brady is correct: we will never see his light again.

"I thank the Murtha family for the opportunity to make this address today. I appreciate this opportunity to bring the greetings and congratulations from Jack Murtha's many friends in the Congress of the United States, on both sides of the aisle, on both sides in the Capitol and all the way down Pennsylvania Avenue.

"I am glad to be with my colleagues—present and former—the Undersecretary of the Army Patrick Murphy—as he mentioned, the first Iraq veteran to serve in the Congress—Congressman Bob Brady, in whose district we are and great friend of Jack Murtha's, Congressman Keith Rothfus, he represents the district that Jack represented in Congress, and as well as Mark Critz, who followed in Jack's footsteps, and Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky, who is here as well—who represented Philadelphia in Congress. It is also an honor to be here with Lieutenant Governor Michael Stack—recognizing the important role that Pennsylvania and Philadelphia play in our national security.

"It is appropriate for us to be here in Pennsylvania to honor Jack Murtha—a state he loved and was proud to represent and to serve. In the House Chamber—Congressman Bob Brady mentioned the 'Pennsylvania Corner'—Jack took great pride that in the House of Representatives, the 'Pennsylvania Corner' was the most bipartisan corner in the Chamber. In the Chamber, everyone gravitated toward Jack Murtha—Democrats and Republicans alike.

"To Brian Cuccias—Brian and the Ingalls shipbuilders, thank you for the skill, hard work and patriotism of all the men and women of labor who built this fine ship that enters service today. And many of you were in Mississippi when Donna christened the ship. It is wonderful to see so many of you here today. Thank you. Thank you for making today possible.

[Applause]

"Commanding Officer, Captain Kevin J. Parker, it was a privilege to be with you last year in Mississippi at the Murtha's christening when you were the prospective commander, and now at this time-honored commissioning ceremony to become the Commanding Officer—that is when Donna gives the signal. When Donna gives the signal—we're all waiting for her.

"And to the sailors and the Marines—the men and women who will crew this ship over the oceans and perhaps ride it into battle, take it to humanitarian assistance—to you,

and your families—thank you for honoring our country, all of us with your bravery and service.

[Applause]

“It is a joy to be with the family members, as my colleagues and others have said, Jack’s daughter, our ship sponsor, Donna, his sons John and Pat, grandchildren, nephews and nieces and others.

“I send the congratulations and thanks of my colleagues in Congress to Joyce—Joyce, the love of Jack’s life. She and Jack were both so proud of having this ship named in his honor but Admiral Joyce was very proud to comment that the ship that she christened, the USS Bonhomme Richard, was a bigger ship. Not a competition, though.

“Service runs deep in Jack Murtha’s family from his brothers, Kit and Jim, to his nephews Brian and Bob—all proud Marines—and his grandson, Lieutenant Jack Murtha in the Air Force, and to Jack’s wife, Captain Amanda Murtha.

“Today, as you commission, as we all commission, the USS John P. Murtha, I want to tell you a little bit about the man your ship is named for—his legacy of strength, effectiveness and fidelity. As was mentioned by my colleague, as a child, John’s grandmother told him: ‘You are put on this earth to make a difference.’ And that’s exactly what he did. John P. Murtha dedicated his entire life to the service of our nation.

“Jack Murtha was a fiercely proud Marine, who volunteered for combat in Vietnam—earning two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star. In the end, Congressman Murtha would leave the Corps with 37 years of service to his name. How proud he was of that.

“In the Congress, Chairman Murtha was a formidable legislator and a towering leader. To watch Jack Murtha legislate was to observe a master at work. But more indicative of his character was to watch him communicate, with our troops in theater, at the Pentagon, and in their hospital rooms.

“His experiences in the battlefield of Vietnam was what fueled his boundless dedication to our men and women in uniform—with that connection to those warriors he frequently visited in Washington, across the country and around the world.

“A few of us had the privilege of traveling in bipartisan delegations with Jack—and this one in particular to Kuwait, a few weeks before the initiation of hostilities into Iraq—we observed the level of detail with which Jack conversed with the soldiers, whether it was the comfort of the seats in their Humvees—how much they could endure as they did their jobs—responding to their needs, providing body and vehicle armor and reliable radios—you name it. Again, not just the big picture, but down to the personal comfort and safety of our troops.

“In those moments, Jack bonded with them, sharing his own personal military experiences, and caring for them really as a father—as Secretary Murtha said, he treated them as family. And they returned his respect.

“We often saw this when he would take groups of us—as Bob mentioned—take groups of us on regular visits to our wounded warriors in the hospitals. One day as we were going into one of the rooms and the nurse came and said, ‘Hold up. Hold up for a while.’ We wanted to be very respectful and sensitive to the privacy of the soldiers. But when we walked in to the room, we saw a young, injured soldier standing at attention by his bed and saluting Jack Murtha wearing a Pittsburgh Steelers jersey right after they had won the Super Bowl.

[Applause]

“That was football but it was very personal with Jack.

“It is important to note that Jack defined our nation’s strength, not only in our mili-

tary might—as important as our military is and the priority that it is—but also our strength is measured by Jack in the health and well being of the American people.

“Chairman Murtha fought for the armed forces—whether it was for what they needed, for our troops, facilities—but he also fought to advance scientific research to seek treatments and cures for breast cancer, prostate cancer, diabetes, and HIV/AIDS—the list goes on and on. Today, at Walter Reed, the John P. Murtha Cancer Center carries forward his commitment to the health of our entire community.

“John Murtha made a difference—for our national defense, for our nation’s health, for the men and women who wear our nation’s uniform.

“Commander Parker, as this fine ship comes alive with her outstanding crew, the strength of the USS John P. Murtha will embody our nation’s promise to stand with you and your crew—through the storm and the calm, both as you defend democracy abroad, and when you come home safely. And when our men and women in uniform come home, Jack wanted them to feel safe as well.

“In the military, he always told us: on the battlefield, we leave no soldier behind. And when they come home, we leave no veteran behind. So I join all of those saluting our veterans who are here today. That was a priority for Jack Murtha.

[Applause]

“‘Semper Fi’ was the watchword of Jack Murtha’s life. And always faithful he was: to his principles, to his promises, to his family and to the nation he loved.

“As we place the Murtha into active service, we also renew our pledge to also always be faithful to you—the sailors and Marines who will board her today, and to every crew who follows.

“Like John P. Murtha, each of you has stepped forward and answered the call to ‘make a difference’—for our country, and for the world. Be proud of the legacy that has been passed down to you, be proud of your ship’s namesake and motto, and be proud of the values you share.

“May God bless the USS John P. Murtha. “May God bless the brave men and women who will serve aboard it—and the privilege of serving as the first crew for one of these great ships, who will be transported within it—and the families who wait for their safe return. You are family to all of us. You will always be in our prayers.

“May God bless you and may God bless the United States of America.”

HONORING BOB STAUF

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as a former school teacher, I know just how dedicated our educators are to their students as well as the community as a whole. In the Bronx and Westchester, no one has displayed that dedication more than Bob Stauf, one of the honorees at this year’s American Irish Association of Westchester Annual Dinner.

Involved in the world of education for a half century, Bob Stauf has taught elementary and junior high students at St. Philip Neri School in the Bronx, in the Yonkers Public School system and Yonkers and Tarrytown Salvation Army citadels. His work with the Salvation Army has also extended to its Advisory Board,

on which he currently serves as President for the Yonkers chapter. Bob is also the President of the 3rd Precinct Police Community Council, Vice President of the American Irish of Westchester, and facilitator of programming of Brahma Kumaris in Westchester. He has also taught adult education and home school instruction with the Yonkers School System and the Children’s Village Yonkers Satellite program.

Bob has also made a difference at the local level through his work in City government. He has chaired the Yonkers Human Rights Commission under two administrations, chaired the Mayors Community Relations Committee and Mayor’s Committee on Irish Affairs, chaired the Yonkers Community Action Program and was Vice Chair of New York State Community Agencies.

In addition, Bob is a good friend who was personally helpful to me just prior to my first trip as a Member of Congress to Ireland. He was a wonderful resource on Irish matters, and even traveled with me on that trip.

This year the American Irish Association of Westchester is honoring Bob Stauf at their Annual Dinner Dance. I want to congratulate Bob on this well-deserved honor and thank him for his many contributions to both the Bronx and Yonkers communities.

CELEBRATING KAZAKHSTAN’S 25 YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. DANA ROHRBACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, on December 16th the people of Kazakhstan will celebrate 25 years of their independence. From the collapse of the Soviet Union to the present day, Kazakhstan has become a valued member in the international community and is a respected voice as a nonpermanent member of the United Nations Security Council. For the United States, the first country to recognize Kazakhstan’s independence, this moment not only symbolizes Kazakhstan’s remarkable development, but also marks 25 years of cooperation and friendship between our two nations.

Our strategic partnership was founded on a shared interest in nuclear nonproliferation and security. When the Soviet Union dissolved, Kazakhstan inherited the fourth largest nuclear stockpile in the world. Rather than using those resources in unproductive ways, through President Nursultan Nazarbayev’s leadership this nuclear arsenal was decommissioned and Kazakhstan has continued to cooperate in these efforts.

Over the 25 years the economic relationship between Kazakhstan and the United States has greatly expanded as well. The Kazakh economy is dynamic and open to the world. From 1993 to 2013 American firms invested more than \$42 billion in Kazakhstan, and trade between our nations is measured in the billions of dollars per year.

The government and the people of Kazakhstan have made great strides in building an economically diverse, multi-ethnic and prosperous country. Kazakhstan exemplifies a country of religious diversity and shows the world how people of various faiths can live together in peace. I congratulate them on that

achievement. In the coming years, I hope to see the cooperation between the United States and Kazakhstan continue to grow as future leaders build on the successful foundation that has already been laid.

HONORING CHIEF KATHLEEN
HARRELL ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Kathleen Harrell, on the occasion of her retirement from the Florida Department of Corrections.

Chief Harrell has given 30 years of distinguished public service to the State of Florida through her knowledge, integrity and leadership. Her tenure at the Florida Department of Corrections began on August of 1986, where she worked as a Field Agent within the Correctional Probation sector. She then spent several years performing professional work investigating, assessing, supervising, counseling, administrating, and/or classifying offenders as a Correctional Probation Officer. It was in 1993 when she joined the Office of Inspector General and strived passionately to become the Assistant Chief of Investigations for the Florida Department in January of 2013. Chief Harrell deserves our admiration and respect for her dedication to public service.

Besides working tirelessly to ensure the wellbeing of Florida's citizens, Chief Harrell dedicates time to worship as a member of the New Mount Olive Baptist Church in Ft. Lauderdale, FL since 2011. She has also been an avid cyclist for ten years and frequently participates in fundraising rides for multiple sclerosis and HIV/AIDS charities. If there's something Chief Harrell loves as much as cycling, it is the Miami Dolphins, being a seasonal ticket holder for around fourteen years now.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to congratulate Chief Kathleen Harrell on her retirement. I wish her the very best of luck in all her future endeavors.

REMEMBERING MR. TOM BAKER

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Tom Baker of Waitsburg, Washington who passed away on November 14, 2016 at the age of 86.

Tom Baker was born on April 17, 1930 in Fort Morgan, Colorado. As a child, he was a member of the Boy Scouts of America, and active in various church, music, and social events. Following his high school graduation, Tom attended the Carnegie Institute of Technology, where he graduated with a Bachelor's of Science in Printing Management in 1953. It was during his college years that he met and fell in love with his wife Anita.

Tom's passion and dream from a young age was to work in newspapers. Following positions with various local newspapers in Colorado, Tom and Anita eventually moved to

Waitsburg in 1963, where Tom bought stake in the Waitsburg Times, eventually becoming editor and publisher in 1964.

As publisher of the Waitsburg Times for 27 years, Tom was able to employ his dry wit and unique style while chronicling the life and times of the people of Waitsburg. Tom officially sold his stake in the Waitsburg Times in 1991, but happily contributed to the paper with his weekly column "TOMfoolery" until 2009. Tom understood the importance of providing the citizens of Waitsburg with a weekly print newspaper tailored to their interests and passions.

An active member of his community, Tom enjoyed spending his time working with the Waitsburg Commercial Club, Masonic Lodge No. 16, the Waitsburg Historical Society, the Waitsburg Presbyterian Church Choir and Board of Elders, the Walla Walla Community College Board of Trustees, and the Washington Newspaper Publishers Association among many others.

Tom was also an active and loyal community servant, who ably filled roles on the Waitsburg City Council and served as Mayor of Waitsburg on two separate occasions.

Tom is survived by his wife of 64 years, Anita, his sons Charles and Loyal, and daughter Peggy, as well as numerous grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Baker was a dedicated public servant and important member of the greater Waitsburg community for many years who will be truly missed. His positive spirit, belief in the good of the community, and devotion to his passions was truly admirable. I will fondly remember Tom Baker and share my condolences with his family.

INTRODUCTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL
AMENDMENT TO ELIMINATE THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE
AND PROVIDE FOR THE DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT
AND VICE PRESIDENT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a constitutional amendment I introduced today to eliminate the electoral college and provide for the direct election of our nation's President and Vice President.

For the second time in recent memory, and for the fifth time in our history, we have a President-elect, who lost the popular vote.

The reason is because of an antiquated system that was established to prevent citizens from directly electing our nation's President.

That notion—that citizens should be prevented from directly electing the President—is antithetical to our understanding of democracy.

In our country, "We the People," are supposed to determine who represents us in elective office.

Yet, we use an anachronistic process for choosing who will hold the highest offices in the land.

It is time for us to fix this, and that is why I have introduced this amendment today.

When the Founders established the electoral college it was in an era of limited nation-

wide communication. It was premised on a theory that citizens would have a better chance of knowing about electors from their home states than about presidential candidates from out-of-state.

The development of mass media and the internet, however, has made information about presidential candidates easily accessible to U.S. citizens across the country and around the world.

Today, citizens have a far better chance of knowing about out-of-state presidential candidates than knowing about presidential electors from their home states. Most people don't even know who their electors are.

As Thomas Jefferson said, "I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions, but laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions change, with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times. We might well as require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors."

Since our nation first adopted our Constitution, "We the People," have amended it repeatedly to expand the opportunity for citizens to directly elect our leaders. What resulted was the following:

The 15th Amendment guarantees the right of all citizens to vote, regardless of race.

The 19th Amendment guarantees the right of all citizens to vote, regardless of gender.

The 26th Amendment guarantees the right of all citizens 18 years of age and older to vote, regardless of age.

And the 17th Amendment empowers citizens to directly elect U.S. Senators.

We need to empower citizens to directly elect the President and the Vice President of the United States.

I am privileged to serve as Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice. My colleagues and I at the Judiciary Committee will be holding a forum next week to examine our outdated presidential election process. I hope members will attend and share their views.

Working together, I know we can fix this historical anomaly, and make our Constitution better reflect the "more perfect Union" to which it aspires.

HONORING MARY KEEHAN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a leader in our community, Mary Keehan, who is an honoree at the American Irish Association of Westchester Annual Dinner Dance.

Mary was born in White Plains, New York to Peter and Catherine Kevill, who emigrated from Ireland and married in Scarsdale. Mary attended White Plains High School and simultaneously worked part-time at Macy's department store. Eventually graduating with honors

and becoming an office manager for a Chiropractor, Mary felt her passion in a different field and decided to return to school in the field of Electrolysis.

Mary combined passion for service and business, and she established her own practice in Electrolysis. Her business has served thousands of people for the past 34 years, while her service to her community through volunteerism made an equally lasting impact.

Mary became a member of the American Irish Association, where she held the office of President in 2008, and currently serves as the financial secretary. Mary is also a member of the Tarrytown LAOH, and is often seen leading the Rockland County Ancient Order of the Hibernian's Pipe Band in marches and parades as "Banner Mom".

With such an impressive record of civic engagement, it's no surprise Mary's list of accomplishments is extensive: President of the Ardsley American Legion Auxiliary for six years, President in 1981 of the Westchester County American Legion Auxiliary, National Board Member at the NYS Electrolysis Association, President of the Ardsley Garden Club, Board Member of the Ninth District of Federated Garden Club of NYS, Board Member of the Girls Scout of Westchester-Putnam, and committee member of Dobbs Ferry Woman's Club. She also serves on the Board of Elections for the Town of Greenburgh.

Married to George Keehan, Mary and her loving husband raised six wonderful children together. She is also the proud grandmother of six amazing grandchildren, her pride and joy.

Mary has shown incredible spirit through her service and love of family. It is an honor to recognize her as one of the American Irish Association of Westchester Annual Dinner Dance Honorees. Congratulations to Mary on this most deserved recognition.

RECOGNIZING THE PEORIA LIONS
ON THEIR STATE TITLE

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor The Peoria Lions for their Class 5A championship win against the Vernon Hills Cougars earlier this week.

Peoria struggled to stop the Cougars in the first half, but the Lions forced three second-half turnovers, allowing them to build a two-score lead. Junior quarterback Coran Taylor threw for 215 yards and two touchdowns, and added 134 yards and three scores on the ground. Fellow junior Geno Hess led all rushers with 215 yards and two touchdowns of his own. In the end the Lions racked up 621 yards in their 62-48 win.

I congratulate the Peoria Lions on their outstanding victory in their 5A championship win. The Lions are now first-time state champions, a testament to the impressive football program that coach Tim Thornton has built.

Mr. Speaker, as a former athlete, I understand how important this is to the young men, the coaches and the community. They never gave up. They kept playing their best, and

their team spirit and belief in themselves helped them become state champions. Their efforts and resilience should inspire us all.

RECOGNIZING SYSCO NORTH
TEXAS' OSHA "STAR SITE" HONOR

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sysco North Texas and its nearly 600 employees for the achievement of being recognized as an OSHA Voluntary Protection Program "Star Site."

The Star Site designation is the highest honor within OSHA's Voluntary Protection Program. The Program rewards companies who lay out a comprehensive compliance and safety risk management plan for internal controls, which translates directly into fewer workplace injuries and illnesses. Sysco North Texas received this award by maintaining a workplace injury incident rating well below the industry average, and by meeting other strict metrics for workplace safety.

Sysco North Texas operates an 800,000 square foot facility in Lewisville, Texas, serving nearly 4,000 customers throughout the Dallas-Fort Worth metro region and beyond. The facility has been in operation since 1973. As an upstanding business in the 24th District of Texas, I am proud to represent Sysco North Texas here in Congress. I commend them and all other businesses around my district as they continue to provide good jobs and safe work environments for Texas citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize the safe and beneficial work environment Sysco North Texas provides for its employees. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing this hard earned achievement.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROBERT W.
LOHR, JR.'S 30 YEARS OF PUBLIC
SERVICE

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to thank Mr. Robert W. Lohr, Jr. for his three decades of extraordinary leadership and service to the town of Purcellville, Virginia, located in my congressional district.

Mr. Lohr has served in local government for 30 years, and for the past 23 years he was the town manager of Purcellville. As town manager he has been instrumental in the growth and development of Purcellville. Mr. Lohr has overseen Purcellville's rapid growth to a community of around 9,000 residents.

In his role as town manager, Mr. Lohr, oversaw a number of important projects to improve the local infrastructure and quality of life for Purcellville's residents. Some of these projects include the development of the Basham Simms Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Purcellville Maintenance Facility, as

well as the effort to preserve and improve historic downtown Purcellville. Mr. Lohr's dedication to bettering the town and the lives of its citizens has been evident during his years of tireless service.

Mr. Lohr's selfless desire to constantly improve Purcellville never went unnoticed, least of all to his colleagues in the town government. Working in close collaboration with the town council, Mr. Lohr was able to identify the needs of the town's citizens, and develop a strategy in order to complete their needed goals.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Mr. Robert Lohr, Jr.'s 30 years of public service, especially those 23 years as town manager of Purcellville, Virginia. Today, we honor and celebrate the contributions he has made to the town and all its citizens. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING JOHN NESGODA AS
THE AMERICAN VETERANS
(AMVETS) POST 1 OF PENN-
SYLVANIA'S VETERAN OF THE
YEAR

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to honor Mr. John Nesgoda for receiving the American Veterans (AMVETS) Post 1 of Pennsylvania's Veteran of the Year Award. AMVETS' mission is to enhance and safeguard the entitlements for all American veterans that have served honorably. Through leadership, advocacy, and engagement, AMVETS work to improve the quality of life for our veterans, their families, and their communities, and John's years of dedication to these principles have earned him this important award.

During the height of the Vietnam War, John answered the call to serve his country and enlisted in the United States Air Force. From 1963 to 1967, John served overseas providing communications support to troops on the front lines. His service to others did not stop after leaving active duty. As 3rd Vice Commander, and a lifetime member of AMVETS Post 1, John leads by example and works every day to ensure that all Pennsylvania veterans are taken care of. He is a lifetime member in the McAdoo Veterans of Foreign Wars Post and a member of the Quakake American Legion. John has also spearheaded fundraising efforts that support veterans' programs like PTSD Working Dogs for PA Veterans, Hazleton Cold Weather Shelters for local veterans, coordinated numerous military funerals, and assists with cemetery maintenance.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Mr. John Nesgoda for receiving the American Veterans (AMVETS) Post 1 of Pennsylvania's Veteran of the Year Award. His years of service, during both active duty and as a veteran, have exemplified his commitment to his country and the military veterans in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. On behalf of my constituents, I thank John for his dedication and wish him and his wife Carol all the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING MARY “SCOTTY”
O’SULLIVAN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a beautiful spirit, Ms. Mary P. O’Sullivan, known commonly around the neighborhood as “Scotty.” Mary went to her eternal home April 18th, 2016 surrounded by her loving family and friends. Though she is no longer with us, Scotty’s contributions to the community will forever live on, as she has left a lasting impact on all of those she was able to touch in life.

Scotty, along with her husband, the late Jimmy “Sonny” O’Sullivan, were the proprietors of “Tara Irish Gift Shop” in Inwood for over 35 years. The store was a local mainstay for decades, selling everything from checkered Irish walking caps and Celtic crosses to green neckties bedecked with little Irish flags. She operated the shop at 609 West 207th Street with Thomas and Kathleen Traynor until 2001, a remarkable run for any business establishment in New York City.

Scotty was also incredibly active in an array of community groups, and was especially active in many Irish-American organizations. She was a long time, beloved active member of the American Irish Association of Westchester and always organized and ran the raffles at the annual Heritage Day. Of course, Scotty’s great love was always family. She is survived by her loving in-laws and many nieces & nephews.

Scotty’s life was an inspiration, and she will forever be a part of the amazing Irish-American community in New York. I want to thank the American Irish Association of Westchester for honoring her at this year’s Annual Dinner Dance.

CELEBRATING SYLVIA
ROSENBLATT’S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Sylvia Rosenblatt, who turned 100 years young in November. Sylvia is a dedicated volunteer in our South Florida community and a beloved mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother.

Throughout her life Sylvia has been committed to helping others. She volunteers for numerous organizations including the Mandel Jewish Community Center and the Forgotten Soldiers Outreach, where she helps pack and ship care packages to soldiers overseas.

I join with Sylvia’s friends, family, and the ACE Lifelong Learning Center in celebrating her birthday. I wish her good health and continued success in the coming year.

HONORING MARCUS JOHN
BRADSHAW

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Marcus John Bradshaw, the grandson of Jimmie Bernstein, and a former neighbor of mine when I lived in Long Beach, California. Marcus John Bradshaw was born to John and Sheri (Bernstein) Bradshaw on July 26, 1988, in Hazel Crest, Illinois. Marcus was blessed to have three older brothers, Eric, John and Timothy. Known for his kindness, Marcus was steadfastly loyal and faithful to all who were blessed to know him.

Marcus attended Western Avenue Elementary School in Flossmoor, Illinois, where he played soccer and baseball. Marcus went to Parker Junior High School in Flossmoor, where he played volleyball, golf, as well as participated in a national chorus. Outside of school, he was a member of a traveling baseball team, for which he played second base. Marcus graduated from Homewood-Flossmoor High School in 2006. He lettered in volleyball, participated in intramural sports, and became an official ball boy for the Chicago Bears. During the 2006 season, Marcus went to the Super Bowl when the Bears played the Indianapolis Colts. His school chronicled his experience as an NFL ball boy for the Chicago Bears in a feature article for its newspaper, the Homewood-Flossmoor High School Voyager. Marcus attended DePaul University, where he participated in the volleyball club and enjoyed playing flag football with friends. In 2010, he earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Management.

Marcus began his professional career as a Brand Ambassador for Powerade and Fuze. He was then promoted to Event Manager for Powerade. He also worked as a Construction Coordinator for Goodman Networks. Following his tenure there, he worked for Bradshaw Construction & Management, first as a Field Inspector at Chicago’s Midway Airport and then as a Quality Assurance Inspector at O’Hare International Airport. Marcus proved to be a consummate professional, known for his strong work ethic and his consistent punctuality.

His travels included Mexico, the Caribbean islands, Australia, as well as two trips to China including the 2008 Olympics in Beijing. Marcus’ sparkling personality, infectious smile, and winning ways reflected his humorous side. He was witty and fun to be around. His favorite pastimes included fantasy football and fantasy basketball. In addition, he skied, continued to play volleyball and golf, and as a testament to his athletic prowess, served as a wide receiver for the Chicago Thunder semi-professional football team.

Marcus truly enjoyed life to the fullest and experienced much in his 27 years. Marcus made his transition to everlasting peace and joy on July 5, 2016, from the rare incurable disease, autoimmune hemolytic anemia. Marcus will forever remain in the minds and hearts of those who love him as his spirit soars with the angels in the presence and love of God.

Marcus is survived by those that honor and cherish his memory including: his parents,

John and Sheri Bradshaw; his brother Eric and his wife Ana; his brother John and his wife, Sylvia; his brother Timothy; his maternal grandmother Jimmie Bernstein; as well as a host of loving family members and a legion of friends throughout the nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOSHUA,
JONLUKE, AND CALEB O’CAIN,
AND ALEX MARJANOVICH

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge Joshua, Jonluke, and Caleb O’Cain, and their friend Alex Marjanovich from my district for their charitable service to our veterans through their book collection efforts. Eagle Scout candidate Joshua O’Cain decided on this endeavor for his final project, which consisted of making boxes where people can donate their used books for the children of our nation’s veterans and active duty service members. Given the need at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center’s pediatric department, these boys decided to focus their efforts at filling their high demand.

I am honored to have these young men living in Virginia’s 10th Congressional District. I commend their hard work to help our veterans and their families who make so many sacrifices to preserve freedom and democracy for others. Their project is a reflection on the noble nature of the Boy Scouts of America’s continuous work to better our great nation. These young men not only embody charity and selflessness, but are also helping inspire it in others.

The O’Cain family has also strived to help servicemen and women through their work with Military Operation Kindness, an organization which sends troops stationed overseas thank you letters and care packages. Astonishingly, the O’Cain family has sent over 600 of these thank you notes this year alone. I cannot express how grateful I am to the O’Cain family and others like them who do so much to aid the members of our armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, Joshua, Jonluke, and Caleb O’Cain and Alex Marjanovich exemplify a spirit of comradery and a dedication to serving others that makes America truly great. I would encourage my colleagues to join me in thanking these young men for their work to help the families of America’s heroes. I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING ST. BARNABAS PARISH

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as we in the Bronx and Westchester celebrate the installation of the seventh Pastor of the St. Barnabas Parish, I want to take a moment to celebrate both the Parish’s rich history and the wonderful people who make up its congregation.

Established in 1910, the parish was placed under the patronage of St. Barnabas with the Reverend Michael Reilly as the first Pastor.

The Parish included what is known as the Woodlawn section of the Bronx and McLean Heights/Yonkers entity, the Church and Rectory were erected on the actual line separating the two cities.

Monsignor George McWeeney was appointed the second Pastor and served until 1965. Under his leadership, a new High School building and Chapel were erected. The third Pastor was Monsignor John J. Considine who served until his retirement in 1986. His twenty-one years as Pastor saw a phenomenal growth in the Parish. The fourth Pastor was Monsignor Timothy S. Collins who served until 1994 when he was appointed Pastor of Our Lady of the Rosary (The Mother Seton Shrine). During his eight years tenure, Monsignor supervised the remodeling of the Rectory, Parish Center and High School Chapel.

The fifth Pastor Monsignor Francis X. Toner was appointed in 1994 until his death in 2003. Msgr. Toner re-organized the parish's services to accommodate the changing demographics of the parish. Monsignor Edward M. Barry, the sixth Pastor, was appointed in 2004. On the occasion of the parish's 100th anniversary Msgr. Barry conducted a fund raiser for the complete renovation of the church, as well as installing an elevator.

And just this year, the St. Barnabas community has warmly welcomed Father Brendan A. Fitzgerald, who served as Pastor of Regina Coeli Parish, Hyde Park, 2012–2016. A native of Ireland, Fr. Fitzgerald has already had a very distinguished career and will no doubt bring great wisdom to the parish. I want to congratulate him on his installation, and congratulate the entire St. Barnabas community.

REMARKS BY FORMER NATO SECRETARY GENERAL ANDERS FOGH RASMUSSEN

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the text of a speech delivered by former Secretary General of NATO Anders Fogh Rasmussen, who is a dear friend and former Prime Minister of our ally Denmark. He spoke at the "Celebration of Democracy" dinner hosted jointly by the National Democratic Institute and International Republican Institute, and his remarks testify to the strong bonds between our nation and its NATO allies. He also reaffirms a core component of our foreign policy: that the world needs strong American leadership in the years ahead, just as it benefited from our leadership in the twentieth century.

I'm extremely pleased to see the International Republican Institute and the National Democratic Institute work so closely together in a bi-partisan manner to promote freedom and democracy.

During the last 70 years, we've got used to a world where protectionism was replaced by free trade, closed societies were replaced by open societies, and dictatorship was replaced by democracy. During these 70 years the world has experienced an unprecedented era of peace, prosperity and progress.

Now, we are living in an era where the fear of the consequences of globalization has led

to stronger support for protectionism, fear over the influx of immigrants and refugees has led to stronger support for closed borders, the fear of chaos and weak leadership in democracies has led to stronger support for tough men and autocracy.

Under these circumstances, there is a strong need for good men and women who will stand up for the basic ideas upon which we so successfully have built and developed our free societies.

Secretary Albright and Senator McCain are such solid people.

As American ambassador to the United Nations and as Secretary of State you, Madeleine Albright, was a staunch proponent of American engagement in the Balkans to stop the bloodshed. And it wasn't until the United States took leadership that a lasting peace was created.

As Secretary General of NATO, I asked you to lead the preparations for a new strategic concept. You and your group of experts did an outstanding job, and in 2010, we adopted a new strategic concept for NATO.

Madeleine, you have always been a steadfast fighter for freedom and democracy. And your mood can always be read in the pins you're wearing. In the book, "Read My Pins", you said: "I had this wonderful antique snake pin. So when we were dealing with Iraq, I wore the snake pin". You had balloons, butterflies and flowers to signify optimism and, when diplomatic talks were going slowly, crabs and turtles to indicate frustration.

John, I'm so happy to also be with you tonight. First of all, congratulations on your re-election as US senator. Recently you turned eighty, but if we didn't know, we wouldn't believe it. You are still going strong, and you are setting an example for all of us to continue working as long as we can.

We have met on several occasions in Europe. You have been a frequent guest at the Munich Security Conference, as leader of the US delegation and as a highly valued speaker. We have never doubted your position as one of the strongest American voices in favor of American global leadership and continued engagement in Europe.

You were disappointed that NATO did not engage more in Syria. You also criticized me. Tonight I can tell you, I agreed with you. But I couldn't get the allies to support even prudent planning for an operation.

John, you have always remembered America's friends and allies. I still recall how warmly you thanked me for my personal support for the United States and my country's contribution to international military operations all over the world.

John, we owe you great respect. And I would like to use this occasion to express my admiration and my gratitude for your service to the United States and to the world.

We all know that Secretary Albright and Senator McCain belong to different political parties. But they are united in their desire to see freedom and democracy flourish in the world. Madeleine and John, you represent the very best in the American democracy: the bi-partisan support for American global leadership.

Let me put it directly: the world needs a policeman. The only capable, reliable and desirable candidate for that position is the United States. We need determined American global leadership.

The world is on fire. The Middle East is being torn up by war, terrorism and humanitarian catastrophes that have forced millions of people to flee. Europe is almost sinking under the refugee burden and internal political division. In North Africa, Libya has collapsed and become a breeding ground for terrorists who are spreading instability

throughout the region. In Eastern Europe, a resurgent Russia has brutally attacked and grabbed land by force from Ukraine. China is flexing its muscle against its neighbors around the South China Sea. North Korea is a rogue state that threatens its neighbors and the United States with a nuclear attack.

There is a link between the American reluctance to use hard power and this outbreak of fire. If the US retrenches and retreats or even if the world thinks that the US retreats, it leaves behind a vacuum that will be filled by the bad guys.

If the United States withdraws to concentrate on "nation building at home", the forces fighting against liberal democracy and our way of life will gain ground. The US will be faced with stronger foes, weaker friends and a more insecure world. That would definitely not make America great.

Appeasement doesn't lead to peace. It just incites tyrants. Any failure to counter oppression will only invite further oppression. That is the lesson of the twentieth century—a lesson we must never forget.

That's why President Truman established a new, rules-based world order, centered around a series of international institutions and economic programs. He created an American led world order that set the stage for the Cold War. Truman elevated engagement to moral choice directly affecting every single American citizen, because it was based on American values. He said: "I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way."

In 1961, President Kennedy expressed what is probably the strongest commitment to American global leadership ever given by a president of the United States: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

And President Reagan ended the Cold War peacefully due to his firm conviction that capitalism is superior to communism. He said: "America's economic success is freedom's success; it can be repeated a hundred times in a hundred nations". He was firmly convinced that peace does not come from weakness or retreat. It comes from economic and military superiority. Peace through strength.

President Truman showed strong leadership and effective conduct by establishing the world order that for seven decades secured an unprecedented peace, development and wealth. President Kennedy came to stand as a beacon for the free world with his energetic and eloquent communication. And President Reagan led the United States and the world to the victory over Communism and oppression by his firm conviction of American exceptionalism.

Hopefully, future US presidents will combine President Truman's effective conduct, President Kennedy's inspiring communication and President Reagan's firm conviction. This would prepare the ground for strong American global leadership and a better and safer world. And make America great again.

The United States is indispensable in its ability to protect and promote freedom and to prevent conflicts, to resolve conflicts and to help with post-conflict reconstruction. However, the United States should not be left to carry out that job alone: Smart American leadership should strive for alliance-building.

There is a need to create an overwhelming, credible, and strong democratic supremacy in order to counterbalance the rising and ascriptive autocracies.

To create a stronger global democratic community, the American president should use his convening power to assemble the

world's true democracies in a strong "Alliance for Democracy". It would be a community of shared values, individual liberty, economic freedom, democracy, and the rule of law; a community that would bolster the identity and potency of democracy in a world where the forces of oppression are trying to regain ground.

The Alliance for Democracy could help confront common security challenges, including terrorism. It could work to make the liberal capitalist democracies more prosperous, competitive, and attractive by promoting commerce, economic growth and job creation. It could help promote democracy directly through advice, support, and assistance. It could be a forum for the coordination of policies in other international organizations, including push for reforms to make the United Nations more effective. And the Alliance for Democracy could also be used for joint action, particularly humanitarian interventions.

Many of us are inclined to believe that the community of values with the best story will win, that the West won the Cold War because the better world view triumphed, and the progress is inevitable.

However, the rise of autocratic powers and Islamic radicalism reminds us that the victory of democratic powers over oppression is not inevitable and it needs not be lasting. History has taught us that we cannot be complacent.

Thomas Jefferson reminded us that "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance". I will continue dreaming of the predominance of capitalism and liberal democracy. I will not accept the argument that certain people are not well suited for democracy.

In a world that grows in freedom and democracy, people will have a chance to raise their families and live in peace and build a better future. The terrorists will lose their recruits and lose their sponsors and lose safe havens from which to launch new attacks, and there will be less room for tyranny and terror.

But to ensure the progress of freedom and democracy, we must ensure an invincible global balance in favor of the forces of freedom and democracy.

You have just had presidential elections. I don't think the American people have mandated retreat. On the contrary, I believe that the outcome of the elections was a reaction to the receding freedom and democracy and the growing terrorism and autocracy that you have witnessed during recent years.

I trust America and American leadership. Of course, also America makes mistakes. But who else should be the leader of the free world? I'm tempted to quote Winston Churchill who once said that the Americans will always do the right thing—after having tried everything else.

Ladies and gentlemen, the world's democracies must rise to the challenge. America must exercise determined global leadership.

HONORING ANDREA M. BROWN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a community servant who has for years worked to improve the lives of her friends and neighbors in Yonkers, Ms. Andrea M. Brown.

Andrea was born and bred in Westchester, the eldest of eight children in Tarrytown, NY. She attended the Tarrytown public schools,

Westchester Business School, and Westchester Community College. She began her community service when she was in her teens, in high school clubs and through her church. In 1970 she married and moved to Yonkers and began her community service in 1974 by volunteering at her oldest daughter's pre-kindergarten class at School 25 and joining the Parent's Group at the Nepperhan Community Center, which led to her becoming a Board Member and eventually Board President.

Andrea's volunteer work only grew from there. She has served her community as President of the Yonkers Branch of the NAACP; Trustee for the Yonkers Board of Education; 1st Vice President of the Empire State Federation of Women's Club, Westchester Region; Member of the Yonkers Mayor's African American Advisory Board; and Vice President of Aquehung Women's Democratic Club, just to name some of her work. She has also received numerous awards for her efforts, including the Martin Luther King Commission Profile Award; the Bethany Lutheran Church Woman of the Year Award; the Women's Civic Club of Nepperhan Woman of the Year Award; The Nepperhan Community Center Community Service Award; and the Dominican Cultural Association Community Service Award.

But for all of her accomplishments, Andrea's greatest treasure was always family. She was married to the late Bernard G. Brown, Sr. and is the mother of two adult children, three grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

The Yonkers Democratic Committee is honoring Andrea this year at their Annual Road to Victory Dinner. Congratulations to her on this great honor.

SHIPPENSBURG UNIVERSITY
FIELD HOCKEY WINS DIVISION II
NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Shippensburg University field hockey team as the 2016 NCAA Division II National Champions. Shippensburg, which is a university in my district, has always been about serving the educational, social and cultural needs of their students, both in the classroom and beyond. The Red Raiders defeated Long Island University Post by a score of 2 to 1 on Sunday, November 20, 2016, capping a 20 win season that was dedicated to former student-athlete and coach, Amanda Strous.

All season long, a number 22 jersey hung in the Robb Sports Complex in honor of Amanda Strous, a former student-athlete and coach at Shippensburg who tragically passed away before the start of the 2016 season. The mantra "Live, Laugh, Love" and hashtag "FlyHigh22" served as inspiration for the team as they sought to "Leave a Legacy" in honor of Amanda.

Shippensburg's emotional season concluded on a cold, fall day at the W.B. Mason Stadium at Stonehill College in Easton, MA. Winning three consecutive games as the lower seed, the No. 3 seeded Red Raiders were lifted to victory by goals from junior forward Emily Bar-

nard and senior forward Katelyn Grazan. Finishing the year as the national leader in goals against average (0.46), save percentage (.899) and shutouts (14), Shippensburg is only the second team in tournament history to emerge from their region as a No. 3 seed and win a national championship.

Mr. Speaker, it is with admiration and respect that I congratulate the Shippensburg University field hockey team for winning the 2016 NCAA Division II National Championship. Such an emotional season could not have a better ending, and I am confident that they will continue to achieve great things both on the field and in the classroom. On behalf of my constituents, I wish the Red Raiders all the best as they enjoy this accomplishment and look forward to next season.

H. CON. RES. 165

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend the House on passage of H. Con. Res. 165, which reaffirms Congress' approach to Israel and Palestine. This bipartisan resolution supports the long-standing approach of the United States as a facilitator of bilateral negotiations between Israel and Palestine. It properly recognizes that a lasting resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will only come about through direct, mutual negotiations between the two parties. Attempts by Congress or other outside bodies to interfere with bilateral negotiations by establishing parameters or imposing solutions on Israel and Palestine will inevitably complicate the situation and delay its peaceful resolution.

Since 1972, the United States has opposed and vetoed 42 United Nations Security Council resolutions dictating binding parameters on the peace process. The current Administration has time and again refused to aid Israel by tolerating Palestinian threats, harming the U.S.-Israeli relationship, and undermining Israel's peacemaking efforts. Israel is our strongest ally in the Middle East, and I believe the country deserves our full support. I have consistently demanded this Administration recognize the importance of Israel, and today's resolution provided another opportunity to affirm my commitment to our relationship with that nation. I strongly urge continued opposition to efforts by the UN Security Council to force agreements that are one-sided or anti-Israel.

Israel has continuously demonstrated its willingness to coexist with its neighbors, and the United States must promote direct talks between Israelis and Palestinians, not the international intervention of the United Nations or other bodies. Through passage of this resolution, the House of Representatives publicly reaffirmed our support for bilateral negotiations between Israel and Palestine, demonstrated the strength of our relationship with Israel, and rebuked faulty attempts to impose the terms of peace.

I was proud to join my colleagues in support of this important resolution.

ROBIN PERKINS NAMED WOMAN OF THE YEAR BY THE GREATER MANASSAS CHRISTMAS PARADE COMMITTEE

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Robin Perkins on being named Woman of the Year by the Greater Manassas Christmas Parade Committee. Mrs. Perkins has diligently served the Manassas community for many years and is more than deserving of this honor.

A lifelong resident of Manassas and devoted community leader, Mrs. Perkins has served her hometown for 33 years in the City of Manassas treasurer's office. After fifteen years of service in that office, she was elected to serve as Treasurer for the City of Manassas. Now, after over eighteen years of service as Treasurer, Mrs. Perkins is entering into a well-deserved retirement.

Though she is leaving her post as Treasurer, Mrs. Perkins will remain a fixture of the Manassas community. She serves as a scout leader, a youth bowling director, and has been a long-time volunteer with the city schools. Her lifelong dedication to her community is an inspiration and I'm proud to represent such a wonderful woman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Robin Perkins for being named Woman of the Year by the Greater Manassas Christmas Parade Committee. It is a privilege to represent her and I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DEBRA SAUNDERS-WHITE

HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the loss of one of our nation's finest public servants, Dr. Debra Saunders-White. She was a good friend and a tireless advocate for increasing access to higher education for all students. This past Saturday, Debra Saunders-White passed away, and I would like to take a brief moment to celebrate her life and legacy.

For many years, Debra Saunders-White was a leading voice in education as she fought to strengthen historical black colleges and universities and other minority serving institutions. As a first generation college graduate, Debra understood both the opportunities afforded by higher education and the many challenges that accompany students as they attempt to access and afford a higher education.

A native of Hampton, Virginia, she attended the University of Virginia before receiving her Masters of Business Administration from the College of William and Mary and her Doctorate in Higher Education Administration from George Washington University. After completing her education, Mrs. Saunders-White

spent 15 years in the private sector, working for IBM as a systems engineer before transitioning to marketing.

From 1999 until 2006, Dr. Saunders-White served as the Assistant Provost of Technology at Hampton University. While at Hampton, she designed and implemented the university's first information technology organization. Her efforts made Hampton University the first HBCU in the nation to join the Internet2 community, where they earned the "most wired university" title by Forbes Magazine and the Princeton Review.

Ultimately, Dr. Saunders-White left Hampton University and spent some time at the University of North Carolina Wilmington (UNCW) as the Vice Chancellor and later served as the Deputy Assistant Secretary at the Department of Education in President Obama's administration. In 2011, Mrs. Saunders-White became the 11th chancellor of North Carolina Central University. During her tenure, Dr. Saunders-White was held in high regard by all of her colleagues and students. Known for her strong vision and leadership, Debra was extremely dedicated to ensuring the success of the students at NCCU while she carried out her vision for growth at the university.

Mr. Speaker, the education and NCCU communities have lost a tremendous advocate for our nation's students. I want to extend my deepest sympathies to her two children, Elizabeth Paige and Cecil III; her mother, Irene Saunders; her brothers, Roger, Ralph and Kyle Saunders, and the rest of her family, friends, and countless students she positively impacted during her life.

HONORING THE LIFE AND WORK OF NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY CHANCELLOR DR. DEBRA SAUNDERS-WHITE

HON. G.K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and work of Dr. Debra Saunders-White, a dear friend, nationally recognized academic, and the eleventh Chancellor of North Carolina Central University in Durham, North Carolina. Dr. Saunders-White transitioned to her heavenly home on Saturday, November 26, 2016 after a courageous battle with cancer. She will be greatly missed by the entire NCCU family and all who knew her.

Dr. Saunders-White was born in Hampton, Virginia on January 8, 1957. As a first-generation college student, she received her undergraduate training at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville. Graduating in the Class of 1979 with a Bachelor's degree in history, Dr. Saunders-White went on to receive a Master's of Business Administration from the College of William and Mary (in 1993) and a Doctorate in Higher Education Administration from George Washington University (in 2004).

The massive outpouring of accolades that arose upon Dr. Saunders-White's passing speaks to her character and abilities. She was installed as the eleventh chancellor of my

alma mater, North Carolina Central University, on June 1, 2013. And, I might add, she became the first permanent woman chancellor in the University's 106-year history.

Prior to assuming her duties at NCCU, she served as the acting Assistant Secretary for the Office of Postsecondary Education at the U.S. Department of Education in the Obama Administration under Secretary Arne Duncan. Dr. Saunders-White joined the Department of Education in May of 2011 as the Deputy Assistant Secretary for higher education programs.

Throughout her tenure as NCCU's Chancellor, Dr. Saunders-White made many important contributions to the University, including increasing the freshman-to-sophomore retention rate from 69 percent to 80 percent; growing faculty and staff annual giving from 19 percent to 76 percent; creating the Triangle area's first dual-enrollment, residential transfer program known as Eagle Connect, in conjunction with Durham Technical Community College; and opening a Fabrication Laboratory in 2015 that is part of a select number of such laboratories at HBCUs.

Always committed to uplifting Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Dr. Saunders-White was named a "cyber star" by Black Issues in Higher Education and has published articles and whitepapers on the role of technology in learning. At NCCU, she was instrumental in raising scholarship funds for students and prioritized innovative academic instruction to prepare students of color to be competitive in the global marketplace.

Beyond her academic contributions, what is more illuminating of Dr. Saunders-White's stellar character was the way she connected with students at the university. She took a personal interest in the scholarship and mentorship program by encouraging "Eagle Excellence" that went beyond success in the classroom. Her dedication to scholarship and preserving the legacy of our Historically Black Colleges and Universities earned her the respect and admiration of students and colleagues alike.

It is dedicated leaders like Dr. Debra Saunders-White whose passionate commitment to helping all students succeed will leave a lasting mark on the future of our students and our country. NCCU (and all of those connected with institutions of higher learning) have lost a great educator and friend. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost a great educator.

Dr. Saunders-White is survived by two children, Elizabeth Paige White and Cecil White, III; her mother, Mrs. Irene Saunders; and her brothers, Roger, Ralph, and Kyle. I hope the outpouring of love shared by the community has been a comfort to Dr. Saunders-White's family.

Today, we remember Dr. Debra Saunders-White and reflect on her motto 'Eagle Excellence.' That motto, which Dr. Saunders-White embodied in her work each day, will remain embedded in the fabric of the University for generations to come.

This is indeed a solemn occasion. But it's also an occasion to celebrate. Dr. Saunders-White fought the good fight, kept the faith, and was a friend to so many and we are all thankful that she was able to touch so many lives. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the life, work, and legacy of Chancellor Debra Saunders-White.

HONORING WILLIAM STALLINGS

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Yonkers' most active and dedicated community members, William Stallings, who is being honored at this year's Yonkers Democratic Committee Annual Road to Victory Dinner.

Originally a product of Charleston, South Carolina, Bill attended public school and became very active in the civil rights movement in his junior and senior years of high school. Upon completion of Burke High School he began working at the Citadel, the military college of South Carolina. After a year, he applied to Tuskegee Institute in Alabama and was accepted. At Tuskegee, he enrolled in the Air Force ROTC and was commissioned 2nd Lieutenant upon graduation. His bars were pinned on him by his grandmother and General Daniel "Chappy" James, and while in the Air Force, he reached the rank of Captain.

It was a recruitment by Pepsi Cola that ultimately brought Bill to Westchester County, where he has remained ever since. He became active in the local Democratic Party in 1974 by engaging in local voter registration drives, and later became a District Leader. He is a member of the NAACP and is very active in his church, Greater Centennial AME Zion Church. He has been an officer of the church for over 25 years, was President of the Greater Centennial Federal Credit Union for over 20 years, and is a founding member of the Greater Centennial Community Development Corporation. Bill has also served on the Board of Directors of the Human Development Services of Westchester (HDSW) for the past 20 years and on the Yonkers Democratic City Executive Committee for over 20 years.

Few have done more to help their local community thrive than Bill Stallings. He is most deserving of this wonderful recognition.

TRIBUTE TO DR. HIRAM SPAIN,
JR.

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate a great American, and outstanding South Carolinian, Reverend Dr. Hiram Spain, Jr. Dr. Spain, who was simply Hiram Spain, Jr. when we shared classes and hallways at South Carolina State College, is retiring from public service. Dr. Spain served as Executive Secretary of the Baptist Educational and Missionary Convention of South Carolina since his election in 2000 until his recent retirement.

Dr. Hiram Spain, Jr. is a native of Conway, South Carolina. In addition to graduating with honors from South Carolina State University, he received the degree of Juris Doctor from Howard University. He did additional studies at the University of South Carolina, Morris College Extension and the Columbia International Seminary. He is presently pursuing the Master of Divinity degree at the Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary. Dr. Spain was ordained

by the Gethsemane Baptist Association and retired as Pastor of the Saint Mark Baptist Church in Columbia, South Carolina.

During my tenure on the staff of Governor John West, I brought Dr. Spain on board where he headed the program that became the state's first Office of Rural Development to outstanding success. He has served as the Chief Executive Officer of the Columbia Urban League and as the first Black Bureau Chief of the South Carolina Department of Social Services.

Dr. Spain serves his community in several civic capacities, including the Board of The United Black Fund of the Midlands, The Executive Board of the Gethsemane Baptist Association, The Board of the South Carolina Christian Action Council, past Board Member of the Communities in Schools of South Carolina, member of the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance of Greater Columbia, Board Member of the I.D. Quincy Newman Institute for social change at the University of South Carolina, Board Member of Partnership, South Carolina, and a life member of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc.

He has received numerous awards and honors for his civic and community service and was recently honored by the City of Columbia and the Midlands Authority for Conventions, Sports and Tourism for his outstanding service and leadership. He has never been reluctant to give of his time and energies to civic, professional and community service organizations. His favorite Bible verse is Psalm 121 verses 1 and 2, "I will lift up mine eyes to the Hills, from whence cometh my help. My help cometh from the Lord, which made heaven and earth."

Dr. Spain is married to the former Doris Bush, a Benedict College graduate and retired teacher at W.A. Perry Middle School. They are the parents of two adult children, both of whom are social work administrators.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and this Congress join me in wishing this outstanding South Carolinian, and longtime personal friend, the Reverend Dr. Hiram Spain, Jr., a long and productive retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAIRFAX ROTARY CLUB

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Fairfax Rotary Club on their 85th Anniversary of community service this year. The Fairfax Rotary Club was chartered in 1931 and has grown from the original 16 members to 75 members today. This organization brings enormous benefit to the City of Fairfax and surrounding communities. I am very grateful for Fairfax Rotary Club's continued efforts to provide humanitarian service and assistance in the 10th Congressional District.

The Fairfax Rotary Club holds weekly meetings and organizes numerous charitable events in order to benefit the community. Their activities range from fundraising to acts of hands-on community service. Some examples of their generous deeds include creating col-

lege scholarships for local students, doing home repairs free of charge, providing free meals to families in need, and raising money for many other charitable causes, such as polio and access to clean water.

The members of the Fairfax Rotary Club are true pillars of their community, and I am proud to represent such service-minded citizens. This organization has a history of providing a setting that fosters fellowship between its members and that enables them to have a positive impact in the world. I applaud the Fairfax City Council's decision to honor this organization by declaring September 25th Fairfax Rotary Club Day in the city.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join in recognizing the 85th Anniversary of the Fairfax Rotary Club and thanking its members for all of the selfless community service work they undertake. I hope that the members of this service organization will continue to find success in their endeavors for many years to come.

HONORING JUDGE TODD J.
CAMPBELL

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Judge Todd J. Campbell on his retirement from the federal bench.

A graduate of Vanderbilt University and the University of Tennessee College of Law, Judge Campbell started his legal career in private practice. After the 1992 election, he joined President-elect Bill Clinton's transition team and later became counsel to Vice President Al Gore.

In 1995, President Clinton nominated Judge Campbell to fill a vacant seat on the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee. Judge Campbell was confirmed the same year by the U.S. Senate, becoming one of America's youngest federal judges in modern times. He eventually was elevated to chief judge, serving many years in that role.

Judge Campbell has led a distinguished career on the federal bench, and he is a pillar of our community. For example, he has led more than 100 naturalization ceremonies, often relating his own family immigration history to Middle Tennessee's newest citizens.

Federal Public Defender Henry Martin best captured Judge Campbell in a recent letter to the editor published in The Tennessean newspaper:

Judge Todd Campbell's announced retirement as a United States District Judge last week was sad news to anyone interested in justice in this community.

I am confident that every lawyer and litigant experienced what I saw there for 20-plus years: an exceedingly well-prepared judge who favored neither side, but treated all who appeared before him with respect, courtesy and usually a smile. I always warned lawyers about to appear in Judge Campbell's court for the first time to be prepared: "he will have read every case you cited, that your adversary cited and ask you about cases you missed that he had found. Then he would listen."

The challenge of determining what the law is in a particular situation and then applying it fairly to complex facts, where the outcome

has a life-changing impact on the people in the case is not only intellectually demanding, but emotionally and physically exhausting. It can also be lonely and thankless work. And yet, Judge Campbell always took the time to thank the lawyers who took indigent defense appointments and was quick to proclaim how important their work was to the preservation of constitutional liberties.

The founders of this country knew that the viability of a society operating under the rule of law depended on the selection of judges who had the intellect to decipher the law, the common sense to shape it to fit human behavior and the courage and integrity to decide controversial issues regardless of popular sentiment.

For better than 20 years Judge Campbell gave exactly that to this community. We are the better for that service and owe him our utmost gratitude.

Henry A. Martin, Federal Public Defender, Nashville 37203.

Judge Campbell has dedicated himself to the federal bench every day he has served. I want to thank Judge Campbell, his wife, Margaret, and their children, Seth and Holt. Judge Campbell represents the very best of our judicial traditions, and I thank him for his long and patriotic service.

HONORING WILLIAM SCRIBNER

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an amazing artist and a true friend, William Scribner. Bill as he was better known brought so much light and beauty to the Bronx through his music, and his contributions to our borough will never be forgotten.

Renowned as one of New York's finest bassoonists, Bill always looked for ways to share his amazing gift with the world and spread his love of music to others. In 1972, he founded the Bronx Arts Ensemble, the premier professional music organization in the Bronx. With a mission to "nourish the arts in the Bronx, serving its diverse communities and developing audiences through arts education and musical performances of the highest professional standard," the organization has touched the lives of thousands of people over the years with their unique performances and beautiful shows. This is largely due in part to Bill's exceptional work, and the amazing assemblage of talent he nurtured and put together.

In addition to presenting over 100 concerts a year, the Bronx Arts Ensemble also specializes in an arts-in-education programming in over 40 schools in the Bronx and beyond with instruction in music, drama, dance, visual arts, capoeira, drumming and more.

Yet for all of Bill's incredible work bringing the arts to the Bronx, his first love was always his family. The beloved husband of Marsha Heller and loving father of Andrew Scribner, Bill is also survived by sister Janice Freeman, cousin Nancy Wirth, stepson Joshua Marantz, and first wife Louise Scribner.

Bill brought so much joy to our community, and enriched the lives of so many. Through the Bronx Arts Ensemble his legacy shall forever live on, and for that I am very thankful. It is an honor to celebrate his amazing life here today.

IN RECOGNITION OF FRAN
PAVLEY OF AGOURA HILLS

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the retirement of my friend Senator Fran Pavley. I had the honor of serving with Fran in both the State Assembly and State Senate. Fran is an extraordinary individual who strove to ensure her community, state, and nation's best interests came first. Her legislative accomplishments are legendary.

Over the last 14 years, Fran became a titan when it came to developing innovative climate change solutions. Her laws elevated California's status as a global leader in fighting climate change and promoting sustainable clean energy. Her bill AB 32, of which I was a co-author, became a model for climate change legislation in other states, nationally and internationally.

With California experiencing severe drought, Fran championed smart water policy by encouraging conservation, recycling, storm water capture, and ground water clean-up. Fran also passed legislation that increased fuel efficiency standards in California. Her law was then modeled at the federal level.

Fran also introduced legislation to encourage more college students to become teachers. In 2015, California had 43,000 teacher vacancies and one of the highest student-teacher ratios in the country. To reduce this burden, Fran presented legislation that would reinstate a loan forgiveness program to motivate more students to pursue a career in teaching.

In addition to Fran's exemplary record of protecting the environment and supporting teachers, she also passed a law that allowed women to receive up to a 12 month supply of birth control prescriptions at one time. Passage of this law was lauded by many health care providers because it reduced the stress of having women acquire birth control on a monthly or quarterly basis.

These tremendous accomplishments cut across various fields and demonstrate Fran's enormous impact. Fran's legacy in the community, state and country will be felt for generations to come.

Actually, this is Fran's second retirement. Prior to serving 14 years in the legislature, Fran was a beloved middle school teacher for 28 years.

After retiring, Fran will continue to spearhead the creation of the first urban and largest wildlife crossing at Liberty Canyon in Agoura Hills. I wish Fran, her husband, and children many years of happiness and good health.

LIBYA

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for six months, the U.S.-backed troops of the interim Libyan Government of National Accord has been fighting street by street to retake the ISIS stronghold of Sirte on the Libyan coast.

ISIS seized control of the city in early 2015 and extended its control along about 155 miles of Libya's coastline. That means that ISIS wields its influence over a territory roughly the distance from Houston to San Antonio.

How did the U.S. get here? How did Libya become an incubator for all stripes of terrorists?

In 2008, U.S. military leaders were calling Libya a top U.S. ally in combating international terrorism. Qaddafi realized that his regime was the target of terrorism, and he changed course from supporting terrorists in the 1980s to siding with the U.S. against the terrorist threat.

However, in 2011, in the midst of a rebellion against the Qaddafi regime, the U.S. decided to intervene and establish a no-fly zone to aid the Libyan rebels.

Under the safety of the no-fly zone the U.S. imposed, Islamist terrorist groups long subdued under Qaddafi's regime sprung up and amassed weapons, training, and military training.

Qaddafi was ultimately killed in October 2011. Within days, NATO and U.S. forces packed up and left Libya to its own devices.

America's only Libya policy at the time was to remove Qaddafi—there was little planning regarding what to do the day after. The U.S. opened the Pandora's box and looked away.

Almost immediately after Qaddafi's ouster, Libya spiraled into chaos. Long simmering political, regional, and ethnic divisions suddenly emerged and set Libya on a path towards disaster. The country has never recovered.

Even the Administration has admitted its role in Libya's failure. Earlier this year, the President admitted that there was no plan for post-Qaddafi Libya, describing it as his biggest regret as President.

Libya has become a regional and international security threat due to this Administration's lack of planning. ISIS and al-Qaeda are the main beneficiaries.

Al-Qaeda's Libyan affiliate, Ansar al-Shariah, emerged shortly after Qaddafi's death and has since become deeply entrenched in the country.

They have successfully filled the void the U.S. helped create by providing social services—building schools and providing medical care.

But they did not stop there. They recruited, armed, and trained terrorist fighters intent on carrying out the group's ultimate goal: imposing Islamic law on the country.

Ansar al-Shariah fighters were among those who ultimately attacked the U.S. diplomatic compound in Benghazi in 2012, killing Ambassador Christopher Stevens and three of his colleagues.

Since then, things have gotten worse. ISIS announced the establishment of a Libyan affiliate at the end of 2014 and soon began consolidating its power around Sirte and expanding east, west, and south.

America should not fool itself into believing that once Sirte is liberated the ISIS threat is over. For close to a year now, ISIS has been redirecting recruits and even senior leaders to Libya. It has been laying the seeds for what many have called a "fallback Caliphate," where it could retreat to in case it is pushed out of Syria and Iraq.

Pentagon estimates from earlier this year suggested that the group's ranks in Libya have swelled to nearly 7,000 fighters.

Liberating Sirte will simply transform the ISIS threat in Libya from a concentrated one

to a dispersed one. They have fanned out throughout the country and will continue to exploit the political mess in Libya.

Libya will unfortunately remain a terrorist foothold for years to come. This is the legacy of the current Administration in North Africa.

The mess the U.S. have left there has spread throughout the region. It endangers Egyptian allies to the east, and the weapons unleashed with Qaddafi's fall have fueled terrorism in places like Syria, Nigeria, and the Sinai Peninsula bordering Israel.

The United States' airstrike campaign in support of the Libyan forces retaking Sirte is only a small step. Until the U.S. can devise a truly comprehensive long-term strategy to stabilize Libya and defeat the terrorist groups hiding there, Libya will continue to threaten regional and international security. Treating the symptoms while ignoring the underlying disease will not solve the problem.

The U.S. forcibly overthrew a regime in Libya, creating chaos that led to a failed state where terrorists flourished and thousands of Libyans died. The U.S. now has a responsibility to work towards a stabilizing solution in Libya. Going forward, the U.S. should be much more cautious before it helps overthrow another regime.

IN RECOGNITION OF CONGRESSMEN ROBERT HURT, RANDY FORBES, AND SCOTT RIGELL

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor three colleagues of mine who have served their Districts and the Commonwealth of Virginia with distinction. Congressman ROBERT HURT from Virginia's Fifth District, Congressman RANDY FORBES from Virginia's Fourth District, and Congressman SCOTT RIGELL from Virginia's Second District have dedicated years of their lives to public service.

Since coming to Congress in 2001, RANDY FORBES, as Chairman of the House Armed Services' Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee, has worked to build a stronger defense for America to help ensure the safety of our nation and has worked with all of us to help our veterans. He also made it a priority to foster partnerships with local officials and other community leaders, earning a reputation for stellar constituent service as a representative.

Congressman SCOTT RIGELL has more active duty and retired military personnel in his district than any other district and has made it a priority to assist them. He had a major role in keeping all East Coast aircraft carriers based in Norfolk.

I had the distinct pleasure of serving with Congressman HURT in the Virginia General Assembly, where he served beginning in 2001 before running for Congress, and he is a gentleman, statesman, constitutional scholar, and most important of all a true friend to the Commonwealth of Virginia. ROBERT has been a leader here in Washington with his great work on the Financial Services Committee and striving to help our small businesses as well as veterans, to name just some of the ways he has worked for a better life for those in his District.

While the Commonwealth of Virginia loses three committed public servants in this body, we all greatly appreciate the years they have put into advancing the priorities of their constituents and the lives of all those in Virginia and in our country.

I know they will continue to serve the public in a variety of ways.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking and honoring these gentlemen for their service to their Districts and for representing their constituents and the Commonwealth in which we call home.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT HURT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 590, and YEA on Roll Call No. 591.

HONORING LOUIS A. PICANI

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the son of an ironworker and former union member myself, I know firsthand just how critical our area's union members are to our country's shared prosperity and success. This year, the Yonkers Democratic Committee is honoring Louis Picani, a dedicated union member who has fought for working men and women in Westchester for over 30 years.

Louis has spent his entire career as a visionary, fighting for workers' rights, fair wages and benefits, workplace safety, and the right to organize. He has been a dedicated union member since he joined Teamsters Local 456 over 30 years ago, where his natural leadership ability quickly emerged and enabled him to be appointed Shop Steward for the City of Yonkers Department of Public Works in 1992. In 1994, Louis became a Trustee of the Teamsters Health and Welfare Fund. In 2005, he was elected as a Teamsters Local 456 Trustee and appointed as a Teamsters Local 456 Business Agent. Louis has been a member of Joint Council 16's New York Teamsters Political Action Committee, and in 2016, was elected President and Principal Officer of Teamsters Local 456. He also serves as Vice President of the Westchester Putnam Central Labor Body.

But Louis' good works extend beyond his labor advocacy. Incredibly, he is also a licensed drug and alcohol counselor.

Louis continues to represent Teamsters members and all labor organizations who serve our work force so proudly. He is incredibly deserving of this honor and recognition, and on behalf of the 16th Congressional District I want to congratulate him on this special occasion.

CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of the Civil Air Patrol, celebrated on December 1st and to honor its all-volunteer members. Since 1941, volunteers have lent their talents in dedicated service to protect Americans and our nation. Their work is deeply appreciated.

The Civil Air Patrol came into existence just six days before the events of Pearl Harbor and was comprised of many civilian aviators, including women and African Americans who were not allowed to fly for the military at that time. Members flew in support of defense forces and provided the military with professional and cost-efficient assistance, which they have continued to provide ever since—chartered by Congress as non-combatative, humanitarian force in 1946, becoming the official Auxiliary to the U.S. Air Force in 1948, and most recently becoming part of the U.S. Air Force's Total Force in 2015.

The Search and Rescue efforts of the Civil Air Patrol are credited with saving an average of 75 lives every year and their Disaster Relief efforts and ability to work closely with partner organizations have been vital to our nation's security and wellbeing. Their service was particularly notable following the terrible events of September 11th, 2001, Hurricane Katrina, and Hurricane Sandy.

I am proud to call myself a member of the Civil Air Patrol. Earlier this week, I was presented with the grade of Lieutenant Colonel and membership in the Patrol's Congressional Squadron. The distinction was presented to me by Lieutenant Colonel Harold Damron and two wonderful young members of the Civil Air Patrol from my district, Cadet Second Lieutenant Laivi Grossman and Cadet Airman Basic Nancy Kahdeman. I thank them and the entire Civil Air Patrol for this opportunity.

The organization's Cadet Program has been a tremendous resource to this nation, providing leadership training to youth, ages twelve through twenty-one. The Program promotes education in the fields of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math, both for participants within the program and their local communities. This is done with a focus on Aerospace and Aviation, developing a passion for them in our younger citizens and ensuring our preeminence in these areas as well as Cyberspace. I believe this effort to be especially important now, as our nation's future and security depend upon the ability of the next generation to lead global progress in these areas.

Civil Air Patrol volunteer professionals serve in every state of the nation and as nonprofit resources within thousands of communities. I am proud to support the work that these men and women continue to do, and I am very pleased to be celebrating this milestone anniversary with them.

IN HONOR OF THE 155TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF BALL'S BLUFF

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the 155th Anniversary of the Battle of Ball's Bluff fought in Loudoun County, Virginia, on October 21st, 1861. Being one of the earliest battles of the American Civil War, Ball's Bluff had an enormous impact on military affairs for the remaining four years of conflict.

On October 20th, 1861, Brigadier General Charles Pomeroy Stone and the Union forces under his command engaged the Confederate forces of Colonel Nathan Evans on the banks of the Potomac River near Leesburg, Virginia. Stone's forces had crossed the river and were subsequently repelled and defeated by their Confederate counterparts. This battle was unique in American history because, as Union forces were withdrawing across the Potomac, Colonel Edward Baker, a sitting U.S. Senator, was killed in action. The defeat, coupled with Colonel Baker's death, was the catalyst for the creation of the Congressional Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War. Colonel Baker remains the only United States Senator killed in battle, and Ball's Bluff proved to be indicative of the long war to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join in recognizing the 155th Anniversary of the Bat-

tle of Ball's Bluff. We must always remember and honor those who sacrificed their lives to preserve our nation in its darkest hour.

HONORING JOHN DECICCO JR.

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 1, 2016

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a leader in our community, John DeCicco Jr. whose humanitarian work is being recognized by The Pelham Civic Association at their Annual Dinner Dance Gala. John is one of three honorees for "Persons of the Year" on November 4, 2016 in my district.

John is the President and CEO of DeCicco & Sons Food Markets. He is a longtime volunteer member of the Pelham Civics, a major contributor to Pelham Civics "Needy Cases Program," which provides food baskets for hundreds of needy families. He also spearheaded the Pelham Civics' 75th Anniversary Dinner Dance Journal in 2014, raising over \$12,000.

John is known for his countless acts of altruism, philanthropy, and charity. He has worked with The Veterans of Foreign Wars, The Wounded Warriors, The Boy and Girl Scouts in an effort to support the community and those in need. He was the recipient of the 2015 Rotary Club of the Pelhams Award for his work supporting children and families.

John also works closely with career placement for special needs students, was a Past Advisory Board Member for the Fordham University Graduate School of Business Entrepreneurship, a former Junior Board Member for the Westchester Italian Cultural Center, Past President of the Pelham Chamber of Commerce, and has worked closely with Governor Cuomo, County Executive Rob Astorino, ConEdison, and NYSEDA in leading an effort to promote "GREEN Markets for the Future" the first of which was opened in Larchmont in December of 2015. The store, which is founded on the principle of being environmentally friendly, has received the EPA's Green Chill Platinum Certification.

John's business, DeCicco & Sons, is also a long-time contributor to Pelham School PTAs, and was the recipient of the 2015 New York State PTA Congress "Golden Oak Award" for exemplary support of the school districts, PTAs and students. DeCiccoco also received the 2015 Westchester's Best Family-Owned Business Award, for continued commitment and active support to the communities in which they live and work, the 2016 Independent Green Business of the Year Award. John married Luisa DeCicco, Ph.D., another honoree, and have two children.

It is an honor to present John with a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at The Pelham Civic Association Annual Dinner Gala. I want to thank him for all he has done in the community and all he continues to do on behalf of Pelham. Congratulations to all honorees of the evening.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6629–S6681

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 7–10, 3489–3493, and S. Res. 627–628. **Pages S6664–65**

Measures Reported:

S. 3084, to invest in innovation through research and development, and to improve the competitiveness of the United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–389)

S. 2201, to promote international trade, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S6663**

Measures Passed:

Iran Sanctions Extension Act: By a unanimous vote of 99 yeas (Vote No. 155), Senate passed H.R. 6297, to reauthorize the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996.

Page S6646

Anti-Semitism Awareness Act: Senate passed S. 10, to provide for the consideration of a definition of anti-Semitism for the enforcement of Federal anti-discrimination laws concerning education programs or activities.

Pages S6649–50

Metropolitan Weather Hazards Protection Act: Senate passed S. 2058, to require the Secretary of Commerce to study the coverage gaps of the Next Generation Weather Radar of the National Weather Service and to develop a plan for improving radar coverage and hazardous weather detection and forecasting, after withdrawing the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto:

Page S6679

Sullivan (for Burr/Cantwell) Amendment No. 5123, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S6679–80**

Sullivan (for Burr) Amendment No. 5124, to amend the title. **Page S6680**

Airport Construction and Alteration Reform Act: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Trans-

portation was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6014, to allow the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into reimbursable agreements for certain airport projects, and the bill was then passed. **Page S6680**

Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1561, to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and the bill was then passed, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Page S6680**

Adopted:

Sullivan (for Cantwell) Amendment No. 5126 (to the language proposed by Amendment No. 5125), to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. **Page S6680**

Sullivan (for Thune/Nelson) Amendment No. 5125, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S6680**

Honoring the Memories of the Law Enforcement Officers in Baton Rouge: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 606, honoring the memories and legacies of the 3 law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the attack on July 17, 2016, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, condemning that attack, and recognizing the heroism of law enforcement personnel and first responders, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S6680**

Colonel Demas T. Craw VA Clinic: Senate passed S. 3492, to designate the Traverse City VA

Community-Based Outpatient Clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Traverse City, Michigan, as the “Colonel Demas T. Craw VA Clinic”.

Pages S6680–81

National Phenylketonuria Awareness Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 627, designating December 3, 2016, as “National Phenylketonuria Awareness Day”.

Page S6681

Authorizing the Printing of the Senate Rules and Manual: Senate agreed to S. Res. 628, authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual.

Page S6681

House Messages:

Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 34, to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S6645–66, S6646–49, S6650–58

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

Page S6645

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 5117, to change the enactment date.

Page S6646

McConnell Amendment No. 5118 (to Amendment No. 5117), of a perfecting nature.

Page S6646

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 5119, to change the enactment date.

Page S6646

McConnell Amendment No. 5120 (to the instructions (Amendment No. 5119) of the motion to refer), of a perfecting nature.

Page S6646

McConnell Amendment No. 5121 (to Amendment No. 5120), of a perfecting nature.

Page S6646

A motion was entered to close further debate on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, December 1, 2016, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, December 5, 2016.

Pages S6645–46

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, December 5, 2016, Senate resume consideration of the message of the House to accompany the bill; and

that the filing deadline for first-degree amendments under rule XXII be at 4 p.m.

Page S6681

Justice for All Reauthorization Act: Senate concurred in the amendment of the House to S. 2577, to protect crime victims’ rights, to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA and other forensic evidence samples to improve and expand the forensic science testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of forensic evidence, to provide post-conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to support accreditation efforts of forensic science laboratories and medical examiner offices, to address training and equipment needs, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases.

Page S6679

Messages from the House: Pages S6660–61

Executive Communications: Pages S6661–63

Petitions and Memorials: Page S6663

Executive Reports of Committees: Pages S6663–64

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S6665–66

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S6666–67

Additional Statements: Pages S6659–60

Amendments Submitted: Pages S6667–79

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S6679

Privileges of the Floor: Page S6679

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—155) **Page S6646**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 6:07 p.m., until 3 p.m. on Monday, December 5, 2016. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S6681.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 2,385 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the oversight, acquisition, testing, and employment of the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) and LCS mission module programs, after receiving testimony from J. Michael Gilmore, Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, Sean J. Stackley,

Assistant Secretary for Research, Development and Acquisition, Department of the Navy, Vice Admiral Thomas S. Rowden, USN, Commander, Naval Surface Forces, and Commander, Naval Surface Force, Pacific Fleet, all of the Department of Defense; and Paul L. Francis, Managing Director of Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Charles P. Blahous, III, of Maryland, and Robert D. Reischauer, of Maryland, both to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

COUNTER-TERRORISM STRATEGY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the future of counter-terrorism

strategy, after receiving testimony from Juan C. Zarate, Financial Integrity Network, Washington, D.C.; and Daniel Benjamin, Dartmouth University John Sloan Dickey Center for International Understanding, Hanover, New Hampshire.

RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management concluded a hearing to examine two Government Accountability Office reports regarding the renewable fuel standard, after receiving testimony from Frank Rusco, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; and Janet McCabe, Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 9 public bills, H.R. 6415–6423; and 3 resolutions, H.J. Res. 104; and H. Con. Res. 177–178 were introduced.

Pages H7118–19

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H7119**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bost to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H7061**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:49 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H7066**

Unanimous Consent Agreement: Agreed by unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 6392 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule 20. **Page H7074**

Unanimous Consent Agreement: Agreed by unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H. Res. 933 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule 20. **Page H7086**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:54 p.m. and reconvened at 5:10 p.m. **Page H7096**

Providing amounts for further expenses of the Committee on Energy and Commerce: The House agreed to H. Res. 933, providing amounts for further expenses of the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, by a recorded vote of 234 ayes to 181 noes, Roll No. 595, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 177 nays, Roll No. 594. **Pages H7086–95, H7096–97**

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017—Rule for consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 937, providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (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, and to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, by a recorded vote of 277 ayes to 139 noes, Roll No. 597, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 180 nays, Roll No. 596. **Pages H7069–74, H7097–98**

Systemic Risk Designation Improvement Act of 2016: The House passed H.R. 6392, to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, by a yea-and-nay vote of 254 yeas to 161 nays, Roll No. 599.

Pages H7074–86, H7098–H7100

Rejected the Maxine Waters (CA) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 178 yeas to 236 nays, Roll No. 598.

Pages H7084–86, H7098–99

Agreed to:

Davidson amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–839) that prohibits the use of international standards not specifically provided in the bill.

Pages H7083–84

H. Res. 934, the rule providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 34) and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6392) was agreed to yesterday, November 30th.

Protection of the Right of Tribes to stop the Export of Cultural and Traditional Patrimony Resolution: The House agreed to take from the Speaker's table and concur in the Senate amendments to H. Con. Res. 122, supporting efforts to stop the theft, illegal possession or sale, transfer, and export of tribal cultural items of American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians in the United States and internationally.

Page H7100

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on pages H7069 and H7096.

Senate Referrals: S. 2971 was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. S. 3183 was held at the desk. S. 3386 was held at the desk.

Page H7117

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7096, H7097, H7097–98, H7098, H7098–99, H7099–H7100. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FORCE MANAGEMENT LEVELS IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN; READINESS AND STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled "Force Management Levels in Iraq and Afghanistan;

Readiness and Strategic Considerations". Testimony was heard from Cary B. Russell, Director, Military Operations and Warfighter Support, Government Accountability Office; General Carter Ham, U.S. Army (Retired); and Lieutenant General Jim Dubik, U.S. Army (Retired).

EXAMINING SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND GENDER DISCRIMINATION AT THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Examining Sexual Harassment and Gender Discrimination at the U.S. Department of Agriculture". Testimony was heard from the following Department of Agriculture officials: Joe Leonard, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights; Lenise Lago, Deputy Chief, Business Operations, U.S. Forest Service; and Denise Rice, Fire Prevention Technician, Region 5 Eldorado National Forest, U.S. Forest Service; and a public witness.

RESTORING THE POWER OF THE PURSE: LEGISLATIVE OPTIONS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations; and Subcommittee on Health Care, Benefits and Administrative Rules, held a joint hearing entitled "Restoring the Power of the Purse: Legislative Options". Testimony was heard from Heather Krause, Acting Director, Strategic Issues, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a business meeting to consider an access request. The request for access was granted. The committee also adopted its Activity Report for the 114th Congress. This meeting was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Operations; and Subcommittee on Transportation and Public Assets, joint hearing entitled "A SafeTrack?: Oversight of WMATA's Safety and Maintenance", 9 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

SECOND SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 4 through November 30, 2016

	<i>Senate</i>	<i>House</i>	<i>Total</i>
Days in session	151	117	..
Time in session	723 hrs., 42'	592 hrs., 15'	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	6,628	7,059	..
Extensions of Remarks	1,556	..
Public bills enacted into law	47	86	133
Private bills enacted into law
Bills in conference	3	3	..
Measures passed, total	404	597	1,001
Senate bills	81	58	..
House bills	94	415	..
Senate joint resolutions	1	1	..
House joint resolutions	1	1	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	12	7	..
House concurrent resolutions	12	24	..
Simple resolutions	203	91	..
Measures reported, total	*296	452	748
Senate bills	218	10	..
House bills	45	372	..
Senate joint resolutions
House joint resolutions	2	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	4
House concurrent resolutions	5	..
Simple resolutions	29	63	..
Special reports	10	4	..
Conference reports	2	3	..
Measures pending on calendar	453	117	..
Measures introduced, total	1,385	2,562	3,947
Bills	1,057	2,102	..
Joint resolutions	13	24	..
Concurrent resolutions	31	71	..
Simple resolutions	284	365	..
Quorum calls	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	154	251	..
Recorded votes	341	..
Bills vetoed	2	3	..
Vetoes overridden	1	1	..

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 4 through November 30, 2016

Civilian nominations, totaling 350 (including 181 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:		
Confirmed		82
Unconfirmed		256
Withdrawn		12
Other Civilian nominations, totaling 2,412 (including 97 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:		
Confirmed		1,401
Unconfirmed		1,010
Withdrawn		1
Air Force nominations, totaling 7,505 (including 181 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:		
Confirmed		5,407
Unconfirmed		2,098
Army nominations, totaling 5,894 (including 1,740 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:		
Confirmed		5,646
Unconfirmed		248
Navy nominations, totaling 4,408 (including 5 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:		
Confirmed		4,338
Unconfirmed		68
Withdrawn		2
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 1,246 (including 3 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:		
Confirmed		1,243
Unconfirmed		3
<i>Summary</i>		
Total nominations carried over from the First Session		2,207
Total nominations received this Session		19,608
Total confirmed		18,117
Total unconfirmed		3,683
Total withdrawn		15
Total returned to the White House		0

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 189 written reports have been filed in the Senate, 459 reports have been filed in the House.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, December 5

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, December 2

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the message of the House to accompany H.R. 34, Tsunami Warning, Education, and Research Act (the legislative vehicle for 21st Century Cures Act), and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill at 5:30 p.m. The filing deadline for first-degree amendments to the message of the House to accompany the bill is at 4 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 2943—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1564, E1567
 Brooks, Mo. Ala., E1558
 Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E1564
 Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1568
 Clyburn, James E., S.C., E1569
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1563
 Collins, Doug, Ga., E1567
 Comstock, Barbara, Va., E1564, E1565, E1568, E1569,
 E1571, E1572
 Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E1569
 Crenshaw, Ander, Fla., E1558

Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1560, E1562, E1563, E1565,
 E1565, E1567, E1569, E1570, E1571, E1572
 Farr, Sam, Calif., E1559
 Frankel, Lois, Fla., E1565
 Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E1560
 Hahn, Janice, Calif., E1565
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1563
 Himes, James A., Conn., E1559
 Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E1566
 Hurt, Robert, Va., E1571
 Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E1561
 LaMalfa, Doug, Calif., E1558
 Levin, Sander M., Mich., E1560

Lieu, Ted, Calif., E1570
 Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E1564
 McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1561
 McGovern, James P., Mass., E1560
 McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E1563
 Miller, Jeff, Fla., E1559
 Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1557
 Neugebauer, Randy, Tex., E1558
 Peterson, Collin C., Minn., E1557
 Poe, Ted, Tex., E1570
 Rohrabacher, Dana, Calif., E1562
 Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1571
 Scott, Robert C. "Bobby", Va., E1568



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.